DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 967	UD 018 506
TITLE	Re-thinking the RFP. A Contractor's Re-Examination of NIE's RFP for the Summative Evaluation of Anacostia RENP. Final Report for Task "O": Verification of Questions, 1976.
INSTITUTION	Gibboney (Richard A.) Associates, Inc., Kensington, Md.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	131p.; Not available in hard copy due to reproduction quality of the original document; For related documents see UD 018 507-515
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Data Analysis; *Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; Formative Evaluation; Government Role; *Policy Formation; Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*District of Columbia (Anacostia); *Response to Educational Needs Project

ABSTRACT

This report examines the National Institute of Education's (NIE's) Request for Proposals (RFP) entitled "Summative Evaluation of the Response to Educational Needs Project (RENP)." The first of six evaluation tasks, Task O, called for the contractor to verify that the questions selected as important were in fact the most important questions to be addressed. The contractor took the following steps in carrying out Task O: (1) reviewed the literature collected by NIE on compensatory education programs, staff development, parents/community involvement, and related matters in order to identify policy questions asked in the past; (2) conducted interviews with policy makers and those who interview policy makers in order to identify policy questions being asked in the present; (3) verified questions contained in the RFP; (4) considered the policy questions RENP data could answer as one limitation to impose on the questions identified while reviewing the literature and conducting the interviews; (5) identified questions the contractor could answer that are asked in the RFP; (6) selected additional questions not asked in the RFP which the contractor could answer; (7) evaluated the importance of the summative evaluation of RENP; and (8) considered the options available to NIE upon completion of Task O. The report's appendices, describing procedures used and materials examined, are included. (MC)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

JUL 26 1978

RICHARD A. GIBBONEY ASSOCIATES, INC.

Consultants in Planning, Development and Evaluation

RICHARD A. GIBBONEY
MICHAEL G. LANGSDORF
ARTHUR L. KOROTKIN

ED157967

RE-THINKING THE RFP

A Contractor's Re-Examination of NIE's
RFP
For the Summative Evaluation of
Anacostia RENP

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Final Report for
Task "O": Verification of Questions
1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted to

The National Institute of Education

UD018506

by the consortium

Richard A. Gibboney Associates, Inc.
Center for Applied Linguistics
Policy Studies in Education
RMC Corporation

1777 Walton Road
Suite 204 — Dublin Hall
Blue Bell, Pa. 19422
(215) 646-7777

10605 Concord Street
Suite 203 A
Kensington, Md. 20795
(301) 949-4510

1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. QUESTIONS POLICY MAKERS ASKED IN THE PAST. 9

3. QUESTIONS POLICY MAKERS ARE ASKING CURRENTLY 12

4. VERIFICATION OF KEY POLICY QUESTIONS CONTAINED IN THE RFP. 14

5. POLICY QUESTIONS RENP DATA COULD ANSWER. 16

6. QUESTIONS CONTRACTOR COULD ANSWER THAT ARE ASKED IN THE RFP. . . . 17

7. QUESTIONS CONTRACTOR COULD ANSWER THAT ARE NOT ASKED IN THE RFP. . 19

8. IMPORTANCE OF THE SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF RENP 21

9. NEXT STEPS FOR NIE 23

10. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS WHICH RENP COULD ANSWER 25

11. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS WHICH ARE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST. 40

12. WHICH QUESTIONS SHOULD BE ANSWERED 44

APPENDIX A: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SEARCH OF THE LITERATURE. A-1

APPENDIX B: LIST OF QUESTIONS AND POSSIBLE ANSWERS FROM DOCUMENTS DEALING WITH COMPENSATORY EDUCATION B-1

APPENDIX C: LIST OF POLICY QUESTIONS POSED BY OFFICIALS INTERVIEWED. C-1

APPENDIX D: LIST OF OFFICIALS INTERVIEWED D-1

APPENDIX E: VERIFICATION OF KEY POLICY QUESTIONS IN THE RFP . . . E-1

APPENDIX F: QUESTIONS NOT IN RFP THAT CONTRACTOR COULD ANSWER . . F-1

PREFACE

In June, 1976, the National Institute of Education issued a Request for Proposal entitled "Summative Evaluation of the Response to Educational Needs Project". While this study would address itself to assessing program outcomes, the traditional foci of most summative evaluations, it would be unique in one major respect. Instead of examining program outcomes as ends in themselves, this evaluation would examine such outcomes as means to inform salient, current policy questions. Thus, this evaluation would cast program outcomes within the larger context of policy debate and would seek to illuminate recurring concerns of educational policy-makers at the federal, state, and local levels.

The request for proposals delineated six tasks, five of which centered around various program thrusts. Embedded within each task were one or more policy questions which, in the opinion of the National Institute of Education, could be informed by data to be collected as a result of this study, and were of concern to key policy-makers. The first evaluation task however, was not concerned with program-specific data. Rather, this task, identified in the Request for Proposals as "Task 0", called for the contractor to verify that the "...questions provisionally selected as most important for various audiences, and most answerable by examination of the program..." were in fact the most important questions that could be addressed during this study. The contractor then was to search the literature, interview key policy-makers, and sift through the documents reviewed by the National Institute of Education in its preparation of the Request for Proposals. Subsequent to such analysis, the contractor was to recommend to the funding agency those policy questions which represented the optimal intersect between concerns of policy-makers and the data potentially available from the project which would help address these concerns.

This report reflects the results of the contractors efforts. Essentially, it reconfirms the findings of the National Institute of Education and concludes that the initial policy questions raised within the Request for Proposals are indeed "burning issues" for policy-makers. The report further recommends that one additional policy question, not originally included within the Request for Proposals be added to the study. We trust that this report, and the task within the Request for Proposals which precipitated it will help to insure that the data to be collected, and the products to be generated from this study over the next year will enable the American public and the educational policy-makers who serve that public to, as the Request for Proposals indicates, "...learn as much as possible to benefit American education...".

1. INTRODUCTION

In August, 1976, NIE contracted with a consortium of four organizations led by Richard A. Gibboney Associates, Inc., for the summative evaluation of Anacostia RENP. The purpose of the evaluation was primarily to answer urgent policy questions of concern to educational decision makers, particularly those who deal with compensatory education programs, education personnel development, and parent/community involvement in education programs.

Purpose of Task "O": Identify Key Policy Questions to be Answered

To verify its own selection of policy questions, NIE stipulated that the contractor's first task (Task "O") would be to retrace the steps NIE had taken in writing the RFP and to supplement those steps. NIE stipulated in the RFP and in later oral instructions that the contractor should answer these five questions:

1. What policy questions have been asked about compensatory education in the past?

This report was prepared by Policy Studies in Education under its subcontract with Richard A. Gibboney Associates, Inc. as part of PSE's work as a member of the consortium evaluating the Anacostia Response to Educational Needs Project (RENP).

2. What policy questions are of strong interest to those responsible for compensatory education today?
3. What policy questions can the contractor answer within the methodological, time, and cost limitations of the summative evaluation endeavor?
4. Have the procedures followed in relation to Task 0 verified the questions, audiences, and designs contained within the RFP?
5. Are there additional questions, not contained within the RFP, which are of concern to policy makers and which RENP data can help to answer?
6. Will performing the scope of work delineated within the RFP be valuable?

Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6 can be thought of as filters for reducing the body of possible inquiries generated by Questions 1 and 2. The policy questions coming through all three filters would be the ones addressed by the contractor.

What is a "Policy" Question?

Since the [illegible]pose Task "0" is to identify the key "policy" questions, the *form* of such questions must be established at the outset.

The Consortium's Technical Proposal (which is incorporated into the current contract between NIE and the Consortium) defines, discusses, and illustrates the term "policy" on pages 6-7 as follows:

> *What is "Policy"?* Definitions vary. For the purposes of this project, we will define a policy as a *guide for discretionary action* adopted by a governing board of laymen (e.g., a local board of education) to guide its professional staff.
>
> A policy statement describes *means* rather than ends. That is, a policy is not a statement of goals and objectives but a guide to *procedures* to be used to achieve them—a guide to procedures preferred for reasons significant to the governing board. (Italics supplied.)
>
> A satisfactory policy statement must be narrow enough to provide *guidance* to the professional staff (otherwise the governing board is not exercising any control, abandoning

its legal and moral obligations) yet be broad enough to leave room for discretion on the part of the professional staff (otherwise the governing board is substituting lay judgments for the expertise of the professional staff, depriving clients of professional services). The distinction is a nice one, but the balance can be struck and maintained with care. For example, a local board of education might say this about staff development:

> Selection of Trainers. Classroom teachers employed in the district may be selected to train other teachers only when:
>
> 1) A significant number of their students
>
> 2) have demonstrated consistent superiority
>
> 3) over comparable students
>
> 4) in significant kinds of learning
>
> 5) over a substantial period of time
>
> 6) as determined by objective measures.

The intent of this statement is quite clear and sufficiently narrow to guide the professional staff. Yet the staff is free to define each term in the elements of the statement and to choose the trainers accordingly. Thus the laymen guide without depriving the staff of their professional prerogatives, affording clients the best combination of lay control with professional expertise.

Equally good illustrations of policy statements adopted by a local board of education are the three investigated by the prime contractor in examining Anacostia RENP earlier this year:*

1. The Local School Boards shall have a direct involvement in their schools' dealings with concerns of importance to their local community.

2. The Anacostia Community School Board shall have a direct involvement in the schools of Region I, dealing with concerns brought to them by the Local School Boards as being untreatable at the local level.

---

*Three Policies of the Anacostia Community School Board: A Study of Their Intent and Operationalization, a Report to NIE by Richard A. Gibboney Associates, Inc. pursuant to Contract Number 400-76-0056 (see page 4).

3. The Unit Task Forces at each school shall include in their composition at least three parents and one student, to provide direct input from the community to RENP.

These three statements clearly meet the definition of "policy" as a guide for discretionary action. They are narrow enough to provide guidance yet broad enough to leave room for discretion. The statements describe means rather than ends; that is, they do not set forth goals and objectives but instead guide procedures to be used in achieving them.

Differences Between Policy, Evaluation, and Research Questions. The Consortium Technical Proposal (incorporated into the current contract between NIE and the Consortium) says this about the difference between the three types of questions (see pages 8-9):

> The distinction is well worth reviewing in a policy-oriented study such as this, partly to establish that NIE and the contractor understand each other about purposes and procedures. To that end, we offer these definitions:
>
> A policy question asks about the wisest alternative for future action, about how to create the future deliberately. It yields advice on how to act to achieve some desired effect.
>
> An evaluation question asks about what may be temporary relationships among variables at a particular point in time in a particular circumstance. It yields conclusions about the effects of past events and past attempts to intervene in those events.
>
> A research question asks about durable relationships among variables over the passage of time and over shifting circumstances. It yields generalizations, possibly explanations, hopefully predictions.

According to these three definitions, then, a policy question asks how to act, an evaluation question asks what happened when a particular action was taken at a particular point in time in a particular circumstance, and a research question asks what usually happens and often why.

Thus we can say the following:

1. Policy-makers decide how things will be done.
2. Evaluators determine what happened when something was done before.
3. Researchers generalize about what usually happens, sometimes explain why, and thus help predict the future.

Clearly, both evaluation-based conclusions about the past and research-based generalizations about the future can guide policy choices made in the present. Note, however, that a policy question cannot be investigated in the form in which it is asked. That is, social actors ask questions which social scientists cannot answer—until they are translated. Social actors (such as policy makers) ask questions in the general form: "How can I accomplish what I want?" Social scientists (such as educational evaluators and educational researchers) can only answer questions in the general form: "What happened the last time an action was taken?" or "What usually happens when such actions are taken?"

Not only must policy questions first be translated into evaluation questions or research questions, but also the evaluation or research answers must then be translated into policy answers. The first translation risks the loss of theoretical relevance for the evaluator or researcher in trying to address the particular problem faced by the policy maker. The second translation risks the loss of practical relevance for the policy maker in trying to apply the findings of evaluators and researchers.

We might imagine a conversation between a policy maker and a researcher, for example, going something like this:

PM: How can I accomplish what I want?

R: I don't know.

PM: You are no help.

R: I can help.

PM: How?

R: Don't ask me what you should do. Ask me what others have done and whether they achieved their objectives.

PM: What have others done and what usually happens?

R: Actions 1, 2, and 3 have usually lead to results A, B, and C, respectively, under conditions w and x but not under condition y unless 1 and 3 were used in combination, which usually produced B or a combination of B and C. Moreover, . . .

PM: I have condition z. If I take action 3, I will get result C?

R: Maybe. No one has ever investigated a condition exactly like yours.

PM: Would you like to investigate my case?

R: I am not interested in your case. I am interested in generalizing. For that, I need a group of cases. And I need cases of actions completed, not actions planned.

PM: What if I want advice on my specific case rather than research-based generalizations?

R: Get a consultant.

One example of research-based and evaluation-based generalizations appears in the Richard A. Gibboney Associates, Inc. study of Anacostia policy-making cited earlier. The report includes the following "strategies which policy-makers can employ to augment the likelihood that their policies will be successfully implemented" (page 5):

1. Value consistency of policies
2. Rational justification of policies
3. Clarity of policy statement
4. Formality of policy transmission
5. Non-contradictory nature of policies

6. Policy follow up

7. Existing skills sufficient for policy implementation

8. Broad participation in policy generation

9. Legitimate exercise of authority in policy adoption

10. Narrow range of variables upon which policy should impact

Those ten generalizations were used to explain the different degrees of implementation accomplished for each of the three different policies.

The definitions of policy, evaluation, and research in the preceding discussion are admittedly policy-oriented. There are, of course, other definitions of all three terms and many definitions of evaluation and research which are not policy-slanted. We have used these definitions deliberately to emphasize how research and evaluation studies such as the one the Consortium is performing can assist policy makers by offering evaluation-based and research-based generalizations. We will return to the distinctions between policy questions, evaluation questions, and research questions later in this report.

Procedures

The contractor took the following steps in carrying out Task 0:

1. Reviewed the literature collected by NIE dealing with compensatory programs, staff development, parents/community involvement, and related matters in order to identify significant policy questions asked in the past.

2. Conducted interviews with a selected group of well-placed policy makers and a selected sample of those who interview such policy makers in order to identify significant policy questions being asked in the present.

3. Verified questions contained in the RFP by citing selected statements contained in the literature.

4. Considered the policy questions RENP data could answer as one limitation to impose on the questions identified while reviewing the literature and conducting the interviews.

5. Identified questions the contractor could answer that ARE asked in the RFP within the methodological, time, and cost limitations of the summative evaluation endeavor.

6. Selected additional questions not asked in the RFP which the contractor could answer during the course of the evaluation.

7. Reflected on the importance of the summative evaluation of RENP, taking into account the questions identified while reviewing the literature and conducting the interviews.

8. Identified next steps for NIE by considering the options available to the Institute upon the completion of Task 0.

The procedures are described in detail and the findings are presented in the succeeding sections of this report.

2. QUESTIONS POLICY MAKERS HAVE ASKED IN THE PAST

Policy Studies in Education conducted a search of selected literature dealing with compensatory education programs, staff development, parent involvement, and related matters. The literature consisted of the documents provided to the contractor by NIE, the documents listed in the RFP, and additional documents selected by the contractor. The literature is listed in bibliographic form as Appendix A.

This literature search was the first of eight procedures used in performing Task 0.

The reading identified various issues which have concerned policy makers and investigators in the past. They included such issues as whether compensatory programs were more effective in the earlier grades than in the later grades, whether inservice training can be better handled by school district personnel themselves than by outside specialists such as university personnel, whether parents should volunteer their time or should be paid to participate in compensatory programs, and whether the evaluation of such programs should be longitudinal rather than cross-sectional.

The issues were classified into six categories, as reported in Appendix B. The six categories were:

- Project Management
- Reading Programs
- Mathematics Programs

- Inservice Teacher Training
- Parent/Community Involvement
- Optimum School Level for Intervention

Appendix B contains a series of questions and possible answers on each topic. Most of the answers were derived from the literature; a few were added by the contractor as the logical completion of an incomplete set of possibilities. The answers are quite extensive because they provide almost all of the alternative responses to each individual question.

Generally, the contractor did not find complete sets of policy issues and alternative answers within single pieces of literature. Instead, it was necessary to select discrete questions and discrete answers from many of the readings and then to reorganize them into an orderly series of issues and alternative answers. Thus, the reader cannot expect to find citations which link each question and its alternative answers to specific books or articles. The authors of the literature represented the broad range of people concerned with compensatory education. They included teachers, administrators, evaluators, researchers, and policy makers. The documents themselves covered the spectrum of sources: national studies conducted by such groups as the Stanford Research Institute, the Ford Foundation, and the Rand Corporation; journals in the field of education such as The Journal of Negro Education, Educational Leadership, The University of Chicago School Review, and The Harvard Educational Review; and other journals outside the field of education such as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Newsletter, The Journal of Human Resources, and The Journal of Political Economy.

The reports, articles, and the books yielded an excellent and, we believe, representative set of questions which policy makers and those who supply information to policy makers have asked in the past. They appear to constitute a well-balanced roster of issues in compensatory education, staff development, parent/community involvement, and related matters.

The examination of the literature also yielded specific quotations which serve to verify the questions posed in the RFP, as explained in the later section titled Verification of Key Policy Questions Contained in the RFP.

3. QUESTIONS POLICY MAKERS ARE ASKING CURRENTLY

Senior staff members of three of the consortium organizations--the Center for Applied Linguistics, Policy Studies in Education, RMC Corporation--interviewed a total of fifteen senior officials in organizations which either make or influence educational policy in compensatory education, staff development, parent/community involvement, and related matters. The fifteen were nominated by the contractor and approved by NIE as being extraordinarily well-situated to sense current policy concerns, both among the staffs and members of their own organizations and other organizations as well. The officials interviewed are listed in Appendix D (most of those listed were interviewed in person, but a few were interviewed by telephone).

This literature search was the second of eight procedures used in performing Task 0.

Because the officials interviewed do shape policy, their concerns and questions are invaluable in providing a context for planning the summative evaluation of RENP.

The questions asked by the policy makers are contained in Appendix C. They reflect the many facets of compensatory education, staff development, parent/community involvement, and related matters that are currently of interest to leading policy makers and those who influence such policy makers. Generally, their questions reflected considerable thought and experience with the issues and a sophisticated understanding of the power which convincing answers to their questions would have over policy decisions. Their questions ranged over such topics as "What is the 'critical mass' of money and effort for compensatory education to make a significant difference?" and "What are the relative merits of separating versus 'mainstreaming' disadvantaged students and instructing them simultaneously with advantaged students?"

While the overlap between the questions asked by the officials and those posed in the RFP is not detailed in this report, there is a considerable amount of overlap offering general verification that the questions raised in the RFP are considered significant by the well-placed officials interviewed.

4. VERIFICATION OF KEY POLICY QUESTIONS CONTAINED IN THE RFP

The prime contractor extracted eight main questions from the RFP and verified them as among the questions of concern to policy makers and those who influence policy makers now and in the past.

This verification was the third of eight procedures used in performing Task 0.

The verification is found in Appendix E. It is divided into five separate topics:

- Staff Development
- Benefits for Students and Community
- Analysis of Resources Required and Associated Costs
- The Historical Study
- The Change Agent Study

Each topic has one or more questions with one citation for each question. These citations all come from the literature listed in the bibliography (See Appendix A). This one citation verifies that the specific question is of concern to policy makers and/or to those who influence policy makers. In all, there are eight questions and eight citations.

Also, for each of the five topics there is a list of intended audiences. The list differs according to topic because certain issues that are of concern to one group are not of concern to another. For example, the intended audiences listed under Benefits for Students and Community are teachers' professional organizations, local school boards, associations of school principals and Congressional sub-committees concerned with Title I of ESEA. On the other hand, the audiences listed under The Historical Study are local school districts, local community groups, and organizations concerned with broad policy issues regarding the Federal role in education, and Congressional sub-committees concerned with Title I. Congressional sub-committees are the only audiences that appear under almost all the topics.

5. POLICY QUESTIONS RENP DATA COULD ANSWER

To list the policy questions the RENP data could answer would be an endless task. Section 6: Questions Contractor Could Answer That Are Asked in the RFP and Section 7: Questions Contractor Could Answer That Are Not Asked in the RFP address the questions which the RENP data might reasonably answer. A full list of those questions is attached as Appendix E: Verification of Key Policy Questions in the RFP, and, Appendix F: Questions Not in the RFP That Contractor Could Answer.

Our analysis makes it evident that the RENP data could answer a very substantial number of questions. NIE must determine which of these potential questions it wishes to have answered during the summative evaluation endeavor, as explained in Section 9: Next Steps for NIE.

Reflecting on the policy questions RENP data could answer was the fourth of eight procedures used in performing Task 0.

6. QUESTIONS CONTRACTOR COULD ANSWER THAT ARE ASKED IN THE RFP

Several questions were addressed in the RFP which the contractor can answer within the methodological, time, and cost limitations of the summative evaluation endeavor.

Identifying those questions was the fifth of eight procedures used in performing Task O.

Those questions have been verified as key policy issues (See Section 4).

The eight questions are:

1. Which approach to inservice training will generate the greatest increase in the number and level of teacher competencies in reading and mathematics?
2. Which strategy is more likely to reduce the achievement gap between inner city students and other students in reading and mathematics as measured by standardized achievement tests, and to increase student attendance and retention?
3. Which intervention point in compensatory education programs is more likely to achieve the largest and most durable effects on student achievement in reading and mathematics?
4. Which strategy for involving and informing parents and community members in and about the education of children is most likely to lead to substantial increases in parent/community knowledge about the schools and to greater involvement in the education of the children?
5. What is the most effective way of spending money to increase teacher competencies in reading and math, to increase student achievement in these areas, and to increase parent/community knowledge and involvement?
6. Which method of organizing social and political forces to develop a program is most likely to lead to desirable outcomes in the increase of teacher competencies, the increase of basic skill levels, and an increase in parental/community knowledge and involvement?

7. Which change agent strategy requiring a large amount of Federal dollars to be spent in a manner consistent with local needs and to achieve goals important to the community and to the Federal government is most likely to generate the greatest positive educational reform?

8. Which change strategy is most effective in positive educational reform?

These eight questions on compensatory education, staff development, parent/community involvement and other related topics will be answered within the limitations of the summative evaluation.

7. QUESTIONS CONTRACTOR COULD ANSWER THAT ARE NOT ASKED IN THE RFP

One of the subactivities for Task 0 which was delineated in the RFP was to present NIE with a list of other candidate questions which might be substituted for those proposed by the contractor in the original submission in response to the RFP. Any such substitution of questions would of necessity have to fall within the methodological, time, and cost limitations of the RENP summative evaluation under the current contract or under a modified contract.

Identifying other candidate questions was the sixth of eight procedures used in performing Task 0.

This section of the report presents those additional questions, divided into two classifications: those which have been derived from a review of the literature cited in the bibliography to this report (See Appendix A) and those evolving from interviews with key policy makers and with those who influence such policy makers (See Appendix B). The questions identified in searching the literature are listed in Appendix B while the questions identified through interviews are listed in Appendix C.

The additional candidate questions are listed in Appendix F. The list does not include all of the questions culled from the literature and the interviews. Rather, the questions are the residue that remain from judging the larger set of questions against three overarching criteria. Those criteria were as follows:

1. Are there sufficient data available within RENP to answer the question?
2. If RENP does in fact represent a crucible of potential

data which would help answer the question, could those data be collected over the next fourteen months?

3. If the other two criteria have been met, could the data be collected within the cost limitations of the contract?

Thus, the questions presented in Appendix F are those which, in our judgement, have met each of the above three criteria.

The questions in Appendix F are presented in descending order of importance. That is, as per the stipulations of the original proposal, the consortium members have ranked the questions according to how important they are for key policy audiences. Essentially, the prioritization depended upon how frequently the issues reflected in the questions were cited within the literature and/or in interviews with key policy makers.

The first set of questions in Appendix F are those which were derived from the literature review. Those questions are subdivided into appropriate topic areas so that the reader may more easily discern the relationship between specific questions and various program elements. The second list of questions, which are also ranked in priority order, are gleaned from interviews with key policy makers: since so few additional questions were generated from the interviews, they have not been subdivided into categories.

8. IMPORTANCE OF THE SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF RENP

Questions examining compensatory education, staff development, parent/community involvement, and other related topics are top priority in the minds of many policy makers and investigators. Title I of ESEA made the problems of the poor education's number one concern. Billions of dollars are spent each year in the hope of finding solutions to the problems of educating disadvantaged children. Reports and articles are written in large volume identifying questions, suggesting solutions, and evaluating results.

The topics listed in the RFP reflect this concern. The cost of compensatory programs, the resources required, the benefits for the students and the community, and others are discussed in the RFP, the literature, and the interviews. This alone proves the importance of the issues. The people involved in education are asking those questions and they want answers.

The summative evaluation of RENP can provide answers to a significant number of those inquiries. However, some policy makers and others who influence them will doubt the credibility of the final report, either because of their historical impressions of the Anacostia project and the special circumstances surrounding it or because of their doubts about what can be extrapolated from the summative evaluation of a single project, whatever its character. Reservations about the credibility of the summative evaluation findings were particularly pronounced among officials in the U. S. Office of Education and certain other officials in professional associations likely to influence the Office of Education. A number of them felt that the results of the summative evaluation might not be transferrable to other compensatory programs.

This is not to say that there are no possible ways of changing the minds of such officials. Three alternatives which NIE may wish to consider for giving those officials a better understanding of RENP, of NIE's reasons for commissioning this summative evaluation, and the potential of the findings for offering constructive guidance to those interested in compensatory education policy are presented in Section 9: Next Steps for NIE. The contractor will be happy to discuss with the NIE Project Officer the best choice from among these or other alternatives.

There are audiences which would not doubt the credibility of the summative evaluation findings. Since many of their questions are the same as those raised in the RFP, they presumably would be pleased to find their answers in the final report of this evaluation endeavor.

Considering the importance of the summative evaluation to those concerned with compensatory education, staff development, parent/community involvement, and related matters was the seventh of eight procedures used in performing Task 0.

9. NEXT STEPS FOR NIE

In the previous sections of this report, we have completed the steps outlined in Michael Langsdorf's memorandum to Howard Lesnick of October 20, 1976. We have answered the following, as listed in pages 6 and 7 of the memorandum:

1. What policy questions have been asked about compensatory education in the past?
2. What policy questions are of strong interest to those responsible for compensatory education today?
3. What policy questions can RENP data answer?
4. What policy questions can a contractor answer within the methodological, time, and cost limitations of the summative evaluation endeavor?
5. Have the procedures followed in relation to Task O verified the questions, audiences, and designs contained within the RFP?
6. Are there additional questions, not contained within the RFP, which are of concern to policy makers and which RENP data can help to answer?
7. Will performing the scope of work delineated within the RFP be valuable?

All of these questions have been discussed in this report.

The next steps are up to NIE. First, the decision must be made as to whether some of the additional questions not found in the RFP are more worthy of study than those listed in the RFP. This decision should be made by NIE and not the consortium. Secondly, NIE must decide what is the best method of establishing the credibility of the RENP data to those who doubt it. We see three possible ways of attempting to solve this problem.

They are as follows:

1. Issue an elaborate description of RENP. Explain that it is a new project not to be confused with the old Anacostia project. Send copies of this description to all policy makers and investigators who doubt the credibility of the data.
2. Ask the policy makers to serve on a steering and review committee. Convene this committee every quarter and go over the progress of the study. Educate them slowly and convince them of the importance of the summative evaluation project.
3. Open the books which are to be published as the final reports with a detailed discussion of why we chose to use the Anacostia data. Take one of two tactics: be proud that we took such a unique project to study because it is so interesting, or, try to persuade the reader that RENP is really not so different from any other compensatory program.

These are alternatives. It is up to NIE to choose the solution it feels would be most appropriate.

The consortium believes that this report completes the requirements of Task 0 as defined in Michael Langsdorf's memorandum.

Additional Questions Which RENP Could Answer

One of the subactivities for Task O which was delineated in the RFP was to present the National Institute of Education with a list of other candidate questions which could be answered within the time and cost limitations of the RENP Summative Evaluation. The purpose of this section of the report is to present such additional questions, divided into two classifications: those which have been derived from a review of the literature cited in the bibliography to this report; and those devolving from interviews with key policy-makers.

The lists which are included in this section do not reflect all of the questions culled from the two sources cited herein. Rather, the issues cited herein are the residue that remain from juxtaposing all of the questions against three overarching criteria. These criteria are as follows: first, are there sufficient data available within RENP to inform the question?; second, if RENP does in fact represent a crucible of potential data which would help inform the question, could these data be collected over the next fourteen months?; third, if the other two criteria have been met, could the data be collected within the cost limitations of the contract? thus, the questions which will be presented in this section are those which, in our judgment, have met each of those three criteria. Finally, the questions are presented in descending order of importance. That is, as per the stipulations of the original proposal, the consortium members have ranked the questions according to how important they are for key policy audiences. Essentially, the prioritization depended upon how frequently the issues reflected in these questions were cited within the literature and/or in interviews with key policy-makers. The first set of questions, which follows, are those which were derived from the literature review. These questions are subdivided into appropriate topic-areas so that the reader may more easily discern the relationship between specific questions and various program elements.

Federal and State Administration of Compensatory Education Programs

1. Should the role of parents and members of the community be limited to setting goals for compensatory programs, or should they participate as staff members in actually operating the programs?

2. How should the learning gains, if any, obtained in early compensatory education programs be maintained during later years of schooling? by continued intervention in the later grades? by having certain students extensively tutored by professionals? by training parents to continue tutoring in the home? by some other alternative?

3. How should compensatory education funds be optimally distributed? should we continue to spend the 61% now being spent to teach reading compared to what is being spent on other aspects of basic skills instruction? is there another proportion which would generate the same or higher outcomes?

4. Should compensatory education programs stress the "back to basics" approach? should it emphasize other important areas of learning?

Project Roles/Responsibilities

1. In funding compensatory education programs, should the federal government limit its role to the awarding and dispensing of funds, should it carefully control the projects use of funds? Should it approve project expenditures? Should it help formulate project goals and objectives? Should it approve all project activities and plans? Should it mandate certain changes and priorities in project plans as needed? Should it provide technical assistance to the projects? Should it insist upon and provide for project evaluation?

2. What should be the role of the local staff in the administration of compensatory education projects? Should it control the projects' use of funds? Should it have unilateral responsibility for selecting staff members? Should it have the primary responsibility for setting project goals and objectives? Should it have the sole responsibility for identifying project target populations? Should it be responsible for coordinating the project with regular classroom instruction?

3. How should a compensatory education project be organized? Should it be located within the existing educational organization, using the lay school board as the policy

making body? Should it be located outside of the existing educational organization, using a policy making board composed of key administrators?

4. Where should the project be operationally placed within the local school system? Should it be an independent subsystem, working autonomously on the content and process of education? Should it be dispersed throughout the system?

Questions Pertaining to Compensatory Reading Programs

1. Within a compensatory reading program, who should teach reading? Classroom teachers? Trained paraprofessional teacher aides? Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides? What should be the characteristics of administrators who have compensatory reading programs in their schools? Should they delegate authority to assistants? Should they provide continual support and assistance for the teaching staff? Should they undertake responsibility to outline and design a reading program? Should they be directly concerned with the implementation of the reading program? Should they keep in direct touch with the classroom through formal and informal visits?

2. What kinds of instructional methods should be used? Systematic instruction immediate, quality feedback? Positive reinforcement and praise? Peer tutoring? Stress on reading achievement? Assigning homework on a regular basis? Framing instructional activities to be carried out in the home with the help of child's family? Techniques of involving students in discussions in class? Use of teacher-directed/struc-

tured/centered activities? Use of student-centered activities?

3. What materials should be utilized in reading instruction? Culturally non-biased traditional materials? Materials with cultural content? A variety in quantity of textbooks and story books? Multi-level materials? Materials appropriate to the child's reading level only? Materials from classroom and school libraries for use in the classroom or at home? Stories based on the children's own experiences? Textbooks with program workbooks? Individualized reading series? Audio visual materials?

4. What should the content of compensatory reading programs be? Phonics? The whole-word approach? The sound symbol approach? Discussions of why learning to read is important and/or rewarding? Relating reading skills to other courses in the curriculum? Test-taking skills? Exercises aimed at general literacy? Exercises tied to specific disciplines? Grammer, sentence structure, and syntax? Reading allowed by the teacher to the students?

5. How should reading instruction be divided during the course of the day? Should it occur all in one sitting? Should it be divided into two or more daily periods? Should it be interspersed with other activities and time allowed for students to practice their skills?

6. How should students be grouped for reading instruction? In small groups? In large groups? In no groups? In no groups, with individualized instruction only? By reading ability?

7. How much school time should be devoted to reading instruction each day? About 30 minutes? About 1 hour? About 90 minutes? About 2 hours? More than 2 hours? In what kinds of school facilities should compensatory reading programs be optimally placed? In modern, new buildings which are physically appealing? In buildings with flexible space? In special reading laboratories or resource centers? In selecting teachers to teach within a compensatory reading program, should program planners look for an optimal mix among variables such as sex, age, experience, academic preparation, extensive background in reading methods and theories, high job satisfaction, teacher's self concept, teacher's ethnic background, teacher's ethnic similarity to students? Or are there other criteria which program planners should use in selecting teachers? Who should be made aware of evaluation results? Classroom teachers? Reading/speech specialists? Trained paraprofessional teacher aides? Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides? Administrators? Special projects personnel? Parents and the community? Some of the aforementioned? In designing compensatory reading programs, should program planners strive to provide a school climate which has a strong emphasis on discipline? One which is quiet and orderly? One which tries to promote a sense of pride in the school and students and faculty and parents? One which is structured? One which is permissive?

8. How should students' reading ability be evaluated? Individually, at the end of each reading assignment? By locally developed reading diagnostic tests? By use of commercially

produced test geared to a single curriculum in use by the school? By standardized, mass-administered reading tests?

9. What should be a realistic goal of compensatory reading programs? That students will raise their reading achievement scores each year? That students will achieve a greater percentile rank in their scores each year? That students will gain one year in their scores for each year in class? That students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group?

Questions Pertaining to Compensatory Programs in Mathematics

1. Who should teach mathematics in a compensatory program? Classroom teachers? Trained paraprofessional teacher aides? Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides?

2. In planning compensatory mathematic programs, what characteristics should program planners look for in administrators? Those who are likely to retain all the authority in the school? Those who are likely to delegate authority to assistants? Those who will provide support and assistance for teaching staff? Those who will mandate a well outlined and designed mathematics program? Those who will be directly connected with the implementation of the mathematics program? Those who will keep in direct contact with the classroom through formal and informal visits?

3. What instructional methods should be used? Systematic instruction with immediate, quality feedback? Positive

reinforcement and praise? Peer tutoring? Stress on mathematics achievement? Assigning homework on a regular basis? Framing instructional activities to be carried out in the home with the help of the child's family? Techniques of involving students in discussions in class? Use of teacher-directed/structured/centered activities? Use of student-centered activities? Use of questioning appropriate for students? Mobility in the classroom while teaching? High rate of drill and practice?

4. What materials should be used in compensatory mathematics instruction? Culturally non-biased traditional materials? Materials with cultural content? A variety in quantity of textbooks? One predominantly used textbook or series? Multi-level materials? Materials from the classroom and school libraries for use in the classroom or at home? Textbooks with program workbooks? Individualized learning activities?

5. What should be the content of compensatory mathematics programs? The "new" math? The "old" math? Discussions of why learning mathematics is important? Relating mathematics skills to other courses in the curriculum? Test-taking skills? Memorization of mathematics "facts"? Word problems? Computational skills? Inductive reasoning? Practical mathematics?

6. How should mathematics instruction be divided during the day? Should it take place all at one sitting? Should it be divided into two or more periods? Should it be interspersed during the day with time for students to practice

their skills?

7. How should students be grouped for mathematics instruction? In small groups? In large groups? In no groups, with individualized instruction only? In ethnically homogeneous groups? According to achievement? According to ability?

8. How much school time should be devoted to mathematics instruction each day? About 30 minutes? About 1 hour? About 90 minutes? About 2 hours? More than 2 hours?

9. In designing compensatory mathematics programs, for what kinds of school facilities should program planners look? Modern, new buildings which are physically appealing? Buildings with flexible space? Buildings which have special mathematics laboratories or resource centers?

10. In electing teachers to teach within a compensatory mathematics program, should program planners look for a blend of teacher characteristics according to the variables of sex, age, experience, academic preparation, background in mathematics teaching methods and theories, teacher's job satisfaction, teacher's self-concept. teacher's ethnic similarity to students? Are there other variables which are more important?

11. Who should be made aware of evaluation results for subsequent use? Classroom teachers? Trained paraprofessional teacher aides? Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides? Administrators? Special projects personnel? Parents and the community?

12. In planning compensatory mathematics programs, should program planners seek to establish a school climate

which has a strong emphasis on discipline? One which is quiet and orderly? One which attempts to instill a sense of pride in students and faculty and parents? One which is structured? One which is permissive?

13. How should students' mathematics ability be evaluated? Individually, at the end of each mathematics assignment? By locally developed mathematics diagnostic tests? By commercially produced tests geared to a single curriculum in use by the school? By standardized, mass-administered mathematics tests?

14. What should be a realistic goal of compensatory mathematics programs? That students will raise their mathematics achievements scores each year? That students will achieve a greater increase in their scores each year? That students will gain one year in their scores for each year in class? That students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group?

Questions Pertaining to Inservice Teacher Training

1. Who should design inservice programs? School district and administrative personnel? College and university faculty members? Federal agencies? Teachers? Parents and community members? Some combination?

2. What is the ideal content for inservice programs related to compensatory education? Teaching methods? Interpersonal relations? Discussing current critical issues? Discussions of new curricula? Use of educational technology?

Planning or instituting educational change? Testing and evaluating students or materials? Establishing educational goals? Writing student behavioral objectives? Diagnosing learning problems? Using teacher aides effectively? Utilizing the physical space in the school more effectively. Investigating new methods of scheduling school time? Using varied methods of grouping students?

3. When should inservice programs take place? Should they occur before school? During school? After school? During the evenings? Over weekends? During the summer?

4. Should teachers be compensated for their participation in inservice training, and if so, how? Should they participate on a voluntary basis with no compensation? Should they be given release time? Should they be given stipends for attending? Should they be given stipends for the completion of useful products? Should they be given inservice credit towards salary differentials.

Questions Pertaining to Parents/Community Involvement

1. Should parents and/or the community be involved in the schools at all?

2. What should be the duties of parents and/or community members in the schools? Should they serve in an advisory capacity? Should they perform some vital functions? Should they both advise and perform?

3. In planning compensatory education programs which involve parents and/or the community, what kinds of

organizational structures should program planners design to optimize this involvement? District-wide advisory councils? Region-wide advisory councils? School advisory councils? Parents/community members serving on various school committees? Opening the classroom to parents and/or community? Having parents/community members as district-wide activity coordinators? As region-wide activity coordinators? As school activity coordinators? As paraprofessional staff members? As home tutors?

4. What methods should program planners use to elicit parents/community response and participation? Home visits? Financial incentives? Workshops? Inservice training? In-media campaign? Mass mailings?

The questions cited above are those which have been distilled from the literature which RENP could help inform. All of these questions, we feel, appropriate for the time and budget limitations of the summative evaluation contract. The following list of questions, which are also ranked in priority order, are gleaned from interviews with key policy-makers: since there are so few additional questions that were generated from this source, we have not subdivided into categories.

1. What should be the criteria for allowing students to remain eligible for continuation in a compensatory education program? Should students be brought to the average achievement level for their age and then lose eligibility? Should they be brought up to the average achievement level for

their grade and then lose eligibility? Should low achieving disadvantaged students who rise to an average achievement level be eliminated from the program? Or, should disadvantaged students be educated to their full potential, taking them beyond average if they are qualified? Should compensatory education programs define as eligible participants only more capable students, for example those who are just slightly below average in achievement, or should they concentrate upon students at the very bottom of the ability and achievement distribution?

2. Should program planners, in designing compensatory education programs attempt to "mainstream" disadvantaged students or should they be separated from other students for some part of the day?

3. How should the special, separate compensatory experiences provided for disadvantaged students be correlated with the regular curriculum which they experience during the remainder of the school day?

4. Should professional associations of teachers participate in designing inservice teacher training? Or, as is the case in RENP, should the community and the school system assume the responsibility for such design?

5. In designing compensatory education programs, should program planners utilize a trainer-teacher ratio of 12:1, as is the case in RENP, or is there another, optimal configuration?

6. Who should decide whether or not teachers need inservice training in order to work in compensatory programs? Should the teachers decide? Should administrators decide?

Should the community decide?

7. How should teachers be compensated by school systems for taking part in inservice training? Should they be given release time? Should they receive extra compensation? Should they not be given any compensation, but participate on a strictly voluntary basis?

8. What should the goals of a realistic compensatory education program be? Should such programs attempt to improve basic skills and other aspects of academic learning? Should they attempt to improve students' attitudes towards themselves? Towards school? Towards learning?

9. How should the outcomes of compensatory education programs be evaluated? Through the use of available, recognized, respected instruments such as objective tests of student achievement? Through the use of specially constructed instruments sensitive to the outcomes of particular programs? Through some combination?

10. Should the role of parents and members of the community be limited to setting goals for compensatory education programs? Or should parents/community members participate as staff members in actually operating the program?

11. In designing compensatory education programs, should program planners, in seeking to be responsive to the needs of the community, listen to a few highly articulate, aggressive parents regarding what "the community thinks", or should planners listen to larger numbers of less articulate, less aggressive parents and community members?

The eleven questions that are cited reflect those which were elicited during interview situations which we believe can be answered within the present summative evaluation contract. We have attempted to place these questions in priority order, using the criteria which were referenced earlier. It is perhaps important to reiterate at this juncture that all of the questions included within these sections can, we believe, be answered during the summative evaluation. It now remains for the National Institute of Education to decide whether in fact some of these questions should be answered during the summative evaluation at the expense of certain other questions included within the original RFP.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS WHICH COULD BE ANSWERED AS PART OF THIS STUDY WHICH ARE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

One of the activities to take place in the accomplishment of Task 0 was to verify that the policy questions contained in the RFP are among those currently of interest to those who influence and formulate educational policy in this country. These questions have been so verified in the final report submitted pursuant to this task. Another of the contractor's responsibilities in relation to this task was to inform the Institute whether or not there were other policy questions, also of concern to policy-makers and those who influence policy, which could be answered within the time, cost, and data constraints of this study. These questions were identified and reported in the Task 0 final report. NIE has further asked the contractor to suggest which if any of the questions contained within the aforementioned list could "better" serve the public interest than the questions contained within the RFP. This is a difficult question to answer, in that the response must be largely judgmental, and dependent upon criteria selected subjectively from the universe of possible criteria that might have been used to answer this question. For example, in attempting to answer this question one must determine how the "public" is defined: is the public limited to those who generate and influence educational policy? is it more broadly defined as the sum total of those persons receiving services in the domain of public education? does it comprise all of the taxpayers whose dollars help pay for the cost of publicly financed education? does it include state and local school boards who are often faced with the task of implementing federal policy? Most of the policy-related literature, while purportly concerned about the notion of public interest, begs the question of definition by presuming to speak for the public. The basis upon which they make this presumption is unclear. Rand Corporation, for example, may argue cogently that "it is in the public interest" to involve the community with the definition, scope, and direction of compensatory education programs. Yet their basis for having made such an assumption is murky at best. Those who generate federal educational policy, do not provide much assistance in helping to clarify the notion of who the public is and on what basis they purport to speak for it. For example, highly placed officials at the United States Office of Education may argue that "it is in the public interest" to discover whether, in compensatory education programs, it is more efficacious to "mainstream" recipients of compensatory services than to segregate them from the remainder of the student body. Yet the basis on which they predicate their assumption regarding public interest is unclear.

The problem then, in responding to the initial question posed in the first paragraph of this document, is twofold: first, who or what is the public? secondly, on what basis can anyone say that option X or option Y "better" serves the public interest? We do not feel that we are in a position to declare by fiat that any given question or set of questions *better* serves the public interest than the questions that are contained within the RFP. However, a review of the literature, and our interviews with key policy-makers, suggest that there are some other questions which might serve the public interest as well as those contained within the RFP. Our rationale for including these questions, and for making the judgment that they also could serve the public interest as well as the original list of questions is that the questions presented in the list below were cited by a broad range of policy-makers (i.e. officials within the United States Office of Education, officials in grass-roots educational organizations, officials at colleges and universities) and/or appeared in a wide array of literature (academic literature on policy such as the Harvard Educational Review or the School Review; journals with a practitioner/bent such as Educational Leadership; and in federal supportly studies dealing with educational policies such as the Rand reports.) The following list is a distillation of those questions, taken from the list of the questions contained within the Task 0 report regarding additional questions which could also be answered as part of this study, which met the criteria stated earlier: namely, these questions seem to be of concern to a wide array of audiences.

1. Should compensatory education programs stress the "back to basics" approach? Should they emphasize other important areas of learning?

2. How should a compensatory education project be organized? Should it be located within the existing educational organization, using the lay school board as the policy making body? Should it be located outside of the existing educational organization, using a policy making board composed of key administrators?

3. Where should the project be operationally placed within the local school system? Should it be an independent sub-system, working autonomously on the content and process of education? Should it be dispersed throughout the system?

4. How should reading and mathematics instruction be divided during the course of the day? Should they occur all in one sitting? Should they be divided into two or more daily periods? Should they be interspersed with other activities and time allowed for students to practice their skills?

5. What should be a realistic goal of compensatory reading and math programs? That students will raise their achievement scores each year? That students will gain one year in their scores for each year in class? That students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group?

6. Who should design and service programs? School district and administrative personnel? College and university faculty members? Federal agencies? Teachers? Parents and community members? Some combination?

7. What should be the duties of parents and/or community members in the schools? Should they serve in an advisory capacity? Should they perform some vital functions? Should they both advise and perform?

8. In planning compensatory education programs which involve parents and/or the community, what kinds of organizational structures should program planners design to optimize this involvement? District-wide advisory councils? Parents/community members serving on various school committees? Opening the classroom to parents and/or community? Having parents/community members as district-wide activity coordinators? As school activity coordinators? As paraprofessional staff members? As home tutors?

9. Should program planners, in designing compensatory education programs, attempt to "mainstream" disadvantaged students or should they be separated from other students for some part of the day?

As stated earlier, the list presented above contains those questions which, we believe, serve the public interest as well as those questions contained within the RFP. Whether in fact the questions "better" serve the public interest is largely a matter of debate.

WHICH QUESTIONS SHOULD BE ANSWERED AS PART OF THIS STUDY

The primary purpose of Task 0 is to identify those questions which should be studied within the context of the REMP Summative Evaluation. To achieve this end, there are five sub-activities which had to be undertaken. These activities are as follows: verification of the policy questions contained within the RFP; identification of other policy questions raised in the literature and/or within interviews with those serving in policy making roles, identification of those questions raised in the literature and/or by policy makers which could be answered within the time, data and cost constraints of this evaluation; identification of those questions from the literature and/or from policy makers which could serve the public interest as well or better as the questions contained within the RFP; and, finally, to present a juxtaposition of the questions contained within the RFP and those which could serve the public interest as well or better than the original questions.

The questions contained within the original RFP have been verified. This verification is contained within the report entitled "Final Report for Task 0; Verification of Questions". Essentially, the report identifies eight policy questions contained within the RFP, and concludes that these questions are important and that they can be addressed within the context of this evaluation. The report also identifies about fifty additional questions raised by policy makers or within the literature which may also be construed as "burning issues". In addition, the report presents a list of policy-related questions raised in the literature and/or by policy makers which could be answered within the aforementioned constraints of this study. In an addendum to the Task 0 report, submitted to the National Institute of Education on November 17, 1976, the contractor submitted a list of nine policy-related questions, distilled from the previous list of additional questions which could be answered within the RENP study. The list submitted on November 17th delineated those questions which could, in the opinion of the contractor, serve the public interest as well as the questions contained within the RFP.

Thus, four of the five sub-activities essential to the realization of the major purpose of Task 0 have been completed. It now remains to juxtapose the questions contained within the RFP with the list of nine questions which would serve the public interest as well as the original questions, to ascertain whether the two sets of questions are mutually exclusive, and if they are, to prioritize those questions not contained within the RFP. Finally, it is incumbent upon the contractor to present a rationale stating whether or not some or all of the additional questions should be answered in lieu of those contained within the RFP. The next section of this document therefore, will attempt to merge, where possible, questions contained within the RFP with some questions raised in the list submitted on November 17th.

Redrafting Some of the Questions

As stated above, there are eight policy-related questions contained within the RFP. The addendum to the Task 0 report submitted to the Institute on November 17, cited nine additional questions which the contractor believed could serve the public interest as well as those questions contained within the RFP. The intent of this section is to briefly examine possible areas of overlap. That is, this section will attempt to answer the question "Is it possible, in some cases, to combine questions from the two sources?" We believe that this is possible to a limited degree.

One of the policy-related questions appearing in the RFP, which we classified under the rhubric "Benefits for Students and Community", was as follows: "Which strategy is more likely to reduce the achievement gap between inner-city students and other students in reading and mathematics as measured by standardized achievement tests, and to increase student attendance and retention: training classroom teachers in specific competencies related to reading and math, as is the case in RENP? Utilizing reading specialists to work with students? Hiring external consultants to work directly with students?"

In the list of questions submitted to the National Institute of Education on November 17, question five asks: What should be a realistic goal of compensatory reading and mathematics programs? That students will raise their achievement scores each year? That students will gain one year in their scores for each year in class? That students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group?"

These two questions, the one from the RFP and the other from the Task 0 addendum, are obviously related. The question contained within the RFP focuses on strategies for reduction in the "achievement gap", while the question from Task 0 addendum implies a realistic expectation for the scope of the reduction of that achievement gap. These questions then should be combined. We suggest, that the original policy question be redrafted and slightly expanded to read as follows:

> Which strategy is more likely to reduce the achievement gap between inner-city and other students in reading and mathematics as measured by standardized achievement tests, and to increase student attendance and retention: training classroom teachers in specific competencies related to reading and math, as is the case in RENP? Utilizing reading specialists to work with students? Hiring external consultants to work directly with students? Regardless of the strategy chosen, what should be a realistic goal for compensatory education programs in terms of their effect on student achievement in reading and mathematics: that students will raise their achievement scores each year? That students will gain one year in scores for each year in class? That students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group?

Thus, the question originally contained in the RFP is retained, and modified to include the notion of what is a realistic impact for compensatory reading and mathematics programs. We believe that this addition to the original question is important for two primary reasons: first, it is a "burning issue", as evidenced by the literature and the interview data.

Second, the question can be informed in the context of the RENP study, and in fact, the contractor will be collecting data pertaining to this question as part of the normal evaluation activities. That is, one of the stipulations of the evaluation contract is to present to the National Institute of Education a set of "realistic expectations" for the magnitude of gain to be associated with the project.

Another of the questions contained within the RFP, also classified under the heading "Benefits for students and Community," was as follows: Which strategy for involving and informing parents and community members in and about the education of children is most likely to lead to substantial increases in parents/community knowledge about the schools and to greater involvement in the education of their children: actively involving parents in the decision-making process? Having parents serve as members of the educational staff and training parents as educators of their own children as well as providing support services for parents as is the case in RENP? A more direct kind of income transfer strategy such as paying parents for their training and attendance at meetings?

One of the questions contained on the list submitted to the Institute on November 17th is as follows: "What should be the duties of parents and/or community members in the schools? Should they serve in an advisory capacity? Should they perform some vital functions? Should they both advise and perform?"

There is an obvious relationship between these two questions, as both focus upon the "optimal" duties of parents and/or community members. The difference between the two questions is minimal, in that the question contained within the RFP cites specific strategies, while the question contained in the November 17th submission differentiates only between "advisory" and "performance" capacities. We suggest that the original question contained within the RFP can be slightly modified, and thus encompass the concerns raised in the question contained within the November 17th submission. We suggest that the question be rephrased as follows:

> Which strategy for involving and informing parents and community members in and about the education of children is most likely to lead to substantial increases in parents/community knowledge about the schools and to greater involvement in the education of the children: actively involving the parents in decision-making process? Having parents serve as members of the educational staff and training parents as educators of their own children as well as providing support services for parents, as is the case in RENP? A more direct kind of income transfer strategy such as paying parents for their training and attendance at meetings? Having parents serve in a purely advisory capacity by informing principals and teachers of their opinions regarding the content of educational programs?

We understand that this question is not totally answerable within the context of RENP. Nor do we believe it was wholly answerable as originally stated. That is, all of the options suggested in the policy question are not in evidence in the RENP project. For example, the notion of "income transfer" is not addressed within RENP. However, RENP should provide a rich array of data which will help inform the question, and this can be supplemented through the literature reviews which are already underway. That is, the original plan was to compare the strategies for parental and community involvement contained within RENP with those attempted in other compensatory education programs. Thus, modifying the question as suggested would entail no additional cost or substantially more work on the part of the contractor.

Questions Which Remain

In the preceding section, we have suggested modifying two of the questions contained in the RFP. If this suggestion is acted upon, the list of nine additional questions submitted to the Institute on November 17th is reduced by two. The question then arises, "what do we do with these seven additional questions?" We do not feel that the seven questions which remain from the November 17th submission can be readily inserted into the framework of the study as it is presently constituted. Yet, these seven questions represent, in the opinion of the contractor, issues which would serve the public interest as well as those questions contained in the RFP. The purpose of this section is twofold: first, to prioritize the seven questions which remain on the basis of those which serve the public interest more than others. It should be noted that the difference between high and low priority questions is slight. In one sense, they are all high priority. That is, the contractor has demonstrated that each of these questions would serve the public interest well. Thus, the distinction of high versus low priority questions on the list which follows is somewhat artificial. To arrive at this priority listing, the contractor has reviewed again all of the literature and interview data. While all of the questions contained in the November 17th submission recur with approximately the same frequency in the interview and/or literature data, the contractor has begun to develop "a sense" that some may be more important than others. That is, while all of the issues are mentioned approximately the same number of times, there are some which tend to be mentioned first. Thus, the list which follows is reflective of the sensibilities engendered by immersion in the data. The second purpose of this section is to present a rationale for each of the questions, arguing either for or against substituting one of these questions for one of those currently contained in the study. The following list is presented in priority order, with concomitant rationales.

1. "In planning compensatory education programs which involve parents and/or community, what kinds of organizational structures should program planners design to optimize this involvement? District-wide advisory councils? Parents/community members serving on various school committees? Opening the classroom to parents and/or community? Having parents/community members as district-wide activity coordinators? As school activity coordinators? As paraprofessional staff members? As home tutors?"

RENP presents a potentially rich source of data for informing this question. Parents do serve on unit task forces which are in some respects analogous to "advisory councils". In some cases, parents have been hired as paraprofessionals. Certainly, parents serve on various school committees. However, there are two possible problems which would be encountered by including this question within the study. First, inclusion of this question would mean that part of the study had to be entirely refocused to include the notion of "parents as policy-makers". The formative evaluation report, as well as the "policy report" that was written during the time of the formative evaluation, reveals the difficulty of obtaining accurate data in this regard. It is difficult, and perhaps not possible, to obtain a clear picture of the involvement of parents as policy makers. Further, even if such a focus could be obtained, it is difficult to partition out the amount of influence RENP has had on parents in this role, versus the amount of influence the school generally has exerted. The second problem is that, as revealed by the formative evaluation and the policy report, the number of parents who serve in policy-making capacities is limited. Therefore, to include this question (and presumably to exclude another question) would necessitate focusing on a relatively small number of parents and thus perhaps lose track of one of the major thrusts of RENP's goals in relation to parents and community members; namely, increasing the knowledge and involvement of a large group of people. Given these caveats it is our recommendation that this question, while admittedly important, should not be included as part of this study.

2. "Who should design inservice programs? School district and administrative personnel? College and university faculty members? Federal agencies? Teachers? Parents and Community members? Some combination?"

Some of the data which will be collected as part of this study, could serve to inform this question. Both parents and community members, and school district and administrative personnel, contributed to the design of the RENP program. However, the contributions of the various groups toward the "final shape" of the project are not always easily distinguishable, and are often, we believe, obscured by the mists of history. It is extremely difficult to identify the specific contributions of this group or that group in the development of the final product. Further, our ability to fully inform this question is partially contingent upon data available from other programs. Thus far in our literature review, we have not found a sufficient pool of data which would enable us to compare RENP with other programs. Therefore, our recommendation is that this question not be included within the study.

3. "How should a compensatory education project be organized? Should it be located within the existing educational organization, using the lay school board as the policy making body? Should it be located outside of the existing educational organization, using a policy making board composed of key administrators?"

There are data which could potentially be collected from RENP which could help inform this question. In theory, RENP does utilize a "lay" board as a policy making body. However, as the formative evaluation report, and the subsequent report examining three policies generated by the Anacostia Community School Board indicate, it is often difficult to distinguish policies which relate to RENP from general educational policies. Further, it is often extremely difficult to isolate "policy" activities per se. Certainly, this is a potential source of problems. Another source of problems lies within the Anacostia Community School Board itself. It is not clear to us that the board would welcome another investigation of its activities. Further, even if such an investigation were to be conducted, it is not clear how actions undertaken by the board could be cogently related to possible program effects. We suspect that the intervening variable of program administration as personified by the Director and the two Associate Directors has far more to do with program outcomes than do any policies generated by the governing board. Thus, while there are data potentially available in RENP which could help to answer the question, we are concerned that such data would be difficult to analyze in meaningful fashion. Consequently, we recommend that this question not be included within the RENP study.

4. "Should program planners, in designing compensatory education programs, attempt to 'mainstream' disadvantaged students or should they be separated from other students for some part of the day?"

RENP is somewhat unique in the annals of compensatory education, in that it provides treatment to all students receiving instruction from a particular teacher. It is true of course that some students do get singled out for intensive remedial work, either in the classroom or in reading/math labs, but all students receive some treatment. It would be, we believe, very feasible to contrast the results of RENP and its treatment approach to those of other programs which segregate students who receive compensatory education for all or part of the day. Certainly, the literature search which is being undertaken under the current configuration of the study, should reveal the existence of other programs which segregate students for all or part of the day. It would involve no great increase in the labor effort to contrast the results of RENP's "mainstreaming" attempts with that of other, different programs. Thus, this is a question which can be addressed within the study at no additional cost to the government or to the contractor. We do, however, foresee one potential problem; namely that of attribution of results. That is, if RENP does demonstrate some effect on student achievement, to what extent can we reasonably argue that the effect is in part or wholly due to the "mainstreaming" approach and that it would not have occurred with an identical approach that differed only in the respect that it segregated students receiving compensatory education. We do not believe that such fine grained analysis will be possible. However, with this proviso firmly in mind, we recommend that the question be included in the general figuration of the RENP study.

5. "Where should the project be operationally placed within the local school system? Should it be an independent sub-system working autonomously on the content and process of education? Should it be dispersed throughout the system?"

RENP is neither a wholly autonomous sub-system nor is it entirely dependent upon DCPS. However, it is more autonomous than it is dependent, and thus could probably provide some data which could help inform this question. Again, however, as was the case with some other questions, RENP does not "cleanly" fit either category. Further, most of the studies which we have thus far reviewed do not provide a lot of data regarding the autonomy versus independent question. Therefore, it is likely that our basis for comparing RENP to other programs would be scanty. Further, it seems to us that this is a question which speaks more to replication or planned variations than it does to an evaluation of the prototypical program. Therefore, we recommend that this question not be included within the RENP evaluation.

6. "How should reading and mathematics instruction be divided during the course of the day? Should they occur all in one sitting? Should they be divided into two or more daily periods? Should they be interspersed with other activities and time allowed for students to practice their skills?"

RENP does have the potential for providing some data in relation to this question. Within RENP classrooms, as within the comparison classrooms, there is some diversity regarding the amount of time devoted to math and/or reading.

Further, the time blocks are divided differently in different classrooms. However, the sample, both experimental and comparison, was not selected on this basis, and to look for differential program effects along the variables suggested by this question would amount to post hoc blocking, which is not immensely desirable. Further, we suspect that should such blocking occur, the cell sizes would be too small to permit statistical manipulation. Further, it was never, insofar as we can determine, the intent of RENP to experiment with the amount of time devoted to reading/math instruction or the way in which that instruction is divided during the course of the day. For these reasons, we recommend that this question not be included in this study.

7. "Should compensatory education programs stress the 'back to basics' approach? Should they emphasize other important areas of learning?"

When we included this question as part of our submission on November 17, we construed "back to basics" as a rigid focus upon reading and mathematics to the exclusion of other important areas such as effect. However, we are cognizant that the term "back to basics" can have several other connotations as well. There are those who argue that the notion "back to basics" implies an entire value structure encompassing rigidity, disciplinary codes, and other facets of student behavior. The issue remains important; however, it lacks focus. We believe that given the controversy which currently exists regarding the "back to basics" movement, there would be enormous problems in including this question as part of the study. We, therefore, recommend that it not be included.

This document completes the five step approach to Task 0. In a very real sense it is the culmination of this Task in that it has suggested a "final" list of questions which should serve as the foci for the remainder of the investigation. Should the Institute choose to accept the recommendations contained herein, namely that two of the questions contained within the RFP be rephrased; that one additional question be added to the study; and that the remainder of the questions contained within the November 17th submittal be dropped from further consideration, we believe that the configuration of the study will be clear and that the latter will focus upon those areas which most clearly serve the public interest.

APPENDICES

A. Bibliography of Search of the Literature

B. List of Questions and Possible Answers from Documents Dealing with Compensatory Education

C. List of Policy Questions Posed by Officials Interviewed

D. List of Officials Interviewed

E. Verification of Key Policy Questions in the RFP

F. Questions Not in RFP That Contractor Could Answer

APPENDIX A

Bibliography of Search of the Literature

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Foundation Goes to School: The Ford Foundation Comprehensive School Improvement Program 1960-1970. Ford Foundation. November, 1972.

"An Empirical Analysis of Selected Follow Through Programs: An Example of a Process Approach to Evaluation." In Seventy-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1972.

Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools. David Armor et. al. Rand. Santa Monica. August, 1976.

"Are There Unusually Effective Schools?" In The Journal of Human Resources. Vol. No. X, I. Robert E. Klitgaard and George R. Hall.

Assessment of Reading Activities Funded Under the Federal Program of Aid for Educationally Deprived Children. A report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. December, 1975.

"Challenging Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers' Perception of Minority Group Children: A Review of Research." In Journal of Negro Education. Vol. 43. Spring, 1974.

Citizen Participation in Education: Annotated Bibliography. Don Davies. Working Paper for the Center for the Study of Education. Institution for Social and Policy Studies. Yale University. December, 1973.

Compensatory Education and Early Adolescence: Reviewing Our National Strategy. Meredith A. Larson and Freya E. Dittmann. Stanford Research Institute. May, 1975.

Compensatory Programming: The Acid Test of American Education. Joe L. Frost and G. Thomas Rowland. Wm. C. Brown Corp., Dubuque, Iowa, 1971.

Data for Decisions: An Analysis of Evaluation Data Needed by Decision Makers in Educational Programs. Carol B. Aslanian, Henry M. Brickell, and Laurel J. Spak. New York: Policy Studies in Education, March 1974.

Does Anyone Need Program Evaluation...? Why Not Find Out! Joseph S. Wholey, Joe N. Nay, John W. Scanlan and Richard E. Schmidt. May 9, 1975.

"Early Childhood: Compensatory Education." Reaching the Disadvantaged Learner. Harry Passow. Teachers College Press: New York, 1970.

"Educational Change Agents: An Inside-Outside Team." Marvin Beckerman. In Educational Leadership. Vol. 30. March, 1973

"Educational Experimentation in National Social Policy." In Harvard Educational Review. P. Michael Timpane. Vol. 40, No. 4. November, 1970.

"Education for Black Americans: Outlook for the Future." In University of Chicago School Review. Edgar C. Epps. Vol. 81, No. 3. May, 1973.

"Education of Disadvantaged Children." In Socio-Econ. Plan. Sci. Alice M. Rivlin and Joseph S. Wholey. Pergamon Press. 1969

Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Ed. by Chester W. Harris. New York: The MacMillan Company. 1960.

"Evaluation Concerns from the Local Practitioner's Point of View." Drs. Bill and Carolyn Raymond. Draft for Journal of Career Education, Spring Edition. November, 1975.

Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vols. I-IV. Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Prepared for the U.S. Office of Education. April, 1975.

Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. George Weber. Council for Basic Education. October, 1971.

Interim Report No. 1: Compensatory Education Study. The National Institute of Education. August, 1975.

"In-Service Training for the Beginning Teacher." Evelyn DiTosto. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. November. 1974.

"Minority Students in Majority Schools." (A summary of a study by Professor Sanford Dornbusch.) Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teacher Education.

Possible Evaluation Thrusts for the Response to Educational Needs Project. 9/24/75

"Prime Time for Education: Early Childhood or Adolescence?" In Harvard Educational Review. William D. Rohwer, Jr. Vol. 41, No. 3. August, 1971.

"Programmatic Development of In-Service Teacher Education." Marvin Pasch. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. September, 1974.

"Reading, Math and Cultural Bias." In The Washington Post. August, 1974.

"Reforming Educational Policy with Applied Research." In Harvard Educational Review. David K. Cohen and Michael S. Garet. Vol. 45. No. 1. Feb., 1975

Research on Teacher Effect (an issue of the Journal of Teacher Education). American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Spring, 1976.

"Resurrecting Meaningful In-Service Training." R.C. Cunningham. In Journal of Reading. Vol. 15. April, 1972

Review of Research Relevant to the Response to Educational Needs Project. Compiled by David I. Falk. August 9, 1974.

"School Crime." In Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Newsletter. May, 1975.

School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools, Office of Education Performance Review, State of New York. March, 1974.

Searchlight: Counseling for Achievement Motivation. Compiled by Richard W. Pratt. Educational Resources Information Center. December, 1975.

Searchlight: Relevant Resources in High Interest Areas. Compiled by Richard W. Pratt. Educational Resources Information Center. December, 1975.

Second Handbook of Research and Teaching. Ed. by Robert M. W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co. 1973.

"Social Returns to Quantity and Quality of Education: A Further Statement." In The Journal of Human Resources. Vol. X, No. I. Charles R. Link and Edward C. Ratledge.

"Student Classification, Public Policy and the Courts." In Harvard Educational Review. David Kirp. Vol. 44, No. 1. Feb. 1974.

"Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." In Harvard Educational Review. Ray C. Rist. Vol. 40, No. 3. August, 1970.

Summaries of Panel Reports: Conference on Studies in Reading. The National Institute of Education. June, 1975.

"The Economic Returns to Increased Educational Spending." In The Journal of Human Resources. Vol. X, No. 1. Thomas I. Ribich and James L. Murphy.

The Effect of Social Contextual Variables on Child Achievement. Nicholas F. Rayder, John C. Larson, and Allan I. Abrams. Paper presented at the 1976 National Convention of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California. April 21, 1976.

"The Production and Distribution of Cognitive Skills Within Schools." In Journal of Political Economy. Vol. 83, No. 3. Byron W. Brown and Daniel H. Saks, 1975.

The Urban Institute Plan for the Design of An Evaluation. John Waller, John Scanlan and Joe Nay. Program Evaluation Research Project. The Urban Institute. October, 1975.

"The University Professor As A Utility Maximizer and Producer of Learning, Research and Income." In The Journal of Human Resources. Vol. X, No.1. E. Beck, Jr.

"Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Education Reform." In Harvard Educational Review. Jerome T. Murphy. Vol. 41, No.1. Feb., 1971.

"Who Runs the Schools." James Cass. October, 1975.

Detailed working notes. Howard Lesnick, Project Officer. Education and Work Group, the National Institute of Education.

Position papers prepared for the Educational Evaluation and Public Policy Conference. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. April, 1976.

Selected ERIC abstracts dealing with compensatory education.

Blayton, Ethel. "The Effects of a Highly Concentrated Reading and Mathematics Program on the Achievement of Inner-City Primary Pupils: Nathan B. Forrest Elementary School." Research and Development Report, Vol. 7, No. 28. November, 1973.

Johnson, Lary. "Minneapolis IPI Mathematics Project 1971-72: Third Year Evaluation." A Title I ESEA Project. November, 1972.

"Plus Program, Buffalo, New York. Elementary Program in Compensatory Education, 2." American Institute for Research in Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, California. 1969.

"Afternoon Remedial and Enrichment Program, Buffalo, New York. Elementary Program in Compensatory Education, 2." American Institute for Research in Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, California. 1969.

Vivona, Carol. "Pupil Performance in the Elementary Schools of Atlanta, Georgia." Research and Development Report, Vol. 6, Nos. 15, 16, and 19. December 1972, March 1973.

APPENDIX B

List of Questions and Possible Answers from Documents Dealing with Compensatory Education

- Project Management
- Reading Programs
- Mathematics Programs
- Inservice Teacher Training
- Parent/Community Involvement
- Optimum School Level for Intervention

● Project Management

There are many questions which need to be answered about project management. What should the federal government's responsibilities be? What should the state government's role be? What activities should be carried out by the local project staff? What is the best organizational design for a local project? Where should the project be operationally placed in the local school system? What is the importance of project leadership?

What should the federal government's responsibilities be?

1. Specifying standards for application/reapplication for funding.
2. Selecting projects for funding.
3. Awarding and dispensing funds.
4. Controlling the project's use of funds.
5. Approving the project's use of funds.
6. Setting project goals and objectives.
7. Identifying project target populations.
8. Approving all project activities and plans.
9. Mandating changes and priorities in project plans as needed.
10. Monitoring the operation of the project.
11. Providing technical assistance to projects.
12. Assessing the degree to which funds reach the intended recipients.
13. Providing for project evaluation.
14. Reviewing and reacting to project reports.
15. Serving as educational leaders and innovators.

What should the state government's role be?

1. Specifying standards for application/reapplication for funding.
2. Selecting projects for funding.
3. Awarding and dispensing funds.
4. Controlling the project's use of funds.
5. Approving the project's use of funds.
6. Setting project goals and objectives.
7. Identifying project target populations.
8. Approving all project activities and plans.
9. Mandating changes and priorities in project plans as needed.
10. Monitoring the operation of the project.
11. Providing technical assistance to projects.
12. Assessing the degree to which funds reach the intended recipients.
13. Providing for project evaluation.
14. Reviewing and reacting to project reports.
15. Serving as educational leaders and innovators.

What activities should be carried out by the local project staff?

1. Controlling the project's use of funds.
2. Selecting staff members.
3. Setting project goals and objectives.
4. Identifying project target populations.
5. Specifying project activities and plans.
6. Carrying out project activities and plans.
7. Providing for project evaluation.
8. Preparing project reports.
9. Coordinating the project and regular classroom instruction.
10. Assisting in local educational decision making.
11. Serving as educational leaders and innovators.

What is the best organizational design for a local project?

1. The project should be located within the existing educational organization and should use the lay school board as the policy-making body.

2. The project should be located outside of the existing educational organization and should have a policy-making board composed of key administrators (chief executive officers of the participating agencies).

Where should the project be operationally placed in the local school system?

1. The project should be an independent subsystem, organizationally and physically separate from the school system, and should work on the content and process of education in this relatively controlled environment.

2. The project should be dispersed throughout the system, thus offering schools new ideas where conditions are favorable.

3. The project should be directed at a special population and provide massive new services and materials.

What is the importance of project leadership?

1. The project has a critical dependence on the project director for success.

2. The project has a high dependence on the project director for success.

3. The project has a moderate dependence on the project director for success.

4. The project has little dependence on the project director for success.

● Reading Programs

There are many questions which need to be answered about reading programs. The questions below ask about the who, what, when, where, why, and how of these programs and the relative levels of student reading achievement they are able to produce.

What is the goal of reading programs?

1. Students will raise their reading achievement scores each year.
2. Students will achieve a greater increase in their scores each year.
3. Students will gain one year in their scores for each year in class.
4. Students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group.

Who should teach reading?

1. Classroom teachers.
2. "Cluster" teachers (regular teachers assigned to assist with a group of classrooms).
3. Reading/speech specialists.
4. Trained paraprofessional teacher aides.
5. Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides.

What characteristics influence the effectiveness of reading teachers?

1. Sex.
2. Age.
3. Experience.
4. Academic preparation.
5. Background in reading methods and theories.

6. Salary.

7. Employment status.

8. Job satisfaction.

9. General intelligence.

10. Verbal ability.

11. Critical reading ability.

12. Teacher's reading for pleasure pattern.

13. Expectations for the students.

14. Teacher's self-concept.

15. Ethnic background.

16. Ethnic similarity to students.

17. Knowledge of students' culture/linguistic background.

18. Match of teacher and students' cognitive styles.

19. Overall quality of teacher.

20. Stability of staff.

What type of administrators have a positive influence on reading programs?

1. Those who are stable in their position.

2. Those who retain all the authority in the school.

3. Those who delegate authority to assistants (especially with instructional capabilities and backgrounds).

4. Those who provide support and assistance for the teaching staff.

5. Those who mandate a well outlined and designed reading program plan.

6. Those who are directly connected with the implementation and/or design of the reading program plan.

7. Those who keep in direct touch with the classroom (through formal and informal visits).

For what grade levels are reading programs (compensatory) appropriate?

1. Preschool.
2. Primary.
3. Intermediate.
4. Junior high.
5. Senior high.
6. Community college or trade school.
7. College or university.
8. Adult night schools.

What instructional methods should be used?

1. Systematic instruction with immediate, quality feedback.
2. Positive reinforcement and praise when appropriate.
3. Peer tutoring (children of the same age).
4. Peer tutoring (older with younger children).
5. Stress on reading achievement (e.g., discussion in school assemblies; lists of reading skills mastered by each child posted on the classroom bulletin board).
6. Teaching bilingual children in their native language first.
7. Teaching bilingual children in English first.
8. Assigning homework on a regular basis.
9. Framing instructional activities to be carried out in the home with the help of the child's family.
10. Television instruction.
11. Techniques of involving students in discussions in class.
12. Use of teacher-directed/structured/centered activities.
13. Use of student-centered ("self-directed") activities.
14. Team teaching.

What should the content of reading programs be?

1. Phonics.
2. Whole-word approach.
3. Sound-symbol approach.
4. Discussions of why learning to read is important/rewarding.
5. Relating reading skills to other courses in the curriculum.
6. Test-taking skills.
7. Exercises aimed at general literacy.
8. Exercises tied to specific disciplines.
9. Exercises as preparation for specific occupations.
10. Career education information.
11. Acquaintance-in-depth study of great literature (depending on the age group).
12. Grammar, sentence structure, syntax (appropriate to the specific age group).
13. Reading aloud by the teacher to the students.

What materials should be utilized in reading instruction?

1. Culturally non-biased traditional materials.
2. Materials with cultural content.
3. A variety and quantity of textbooks and storybooks.
4. One predominantly used textbook or series.
5. Multi-level materials.
6. Materials appropriate to the child's reading level only.
7. Materials from classroom and school libraries for use in the classroom or at home.
8. Stories based on the children's own experiences.
9. Textbooks with programmed workbooks.
10. Machine-programmed materials.
11. Individualized reading series.
12. Audio-visual materials.

How should students be grouped for reading instruction?

1. No grouping--individualized instruction only.
2. Small groups (up to 15).
3. Large groups (more than 15).
4. Ethnically homogeneous groups.
5. Ethnically heterogeneous groups.
6. Ability (reading performance) groups.

How much school time should be devoted to reading instruction?

1. Approximately 30 minutes per day.
2. Approximately 1 hour per day.
3. Approximately 90 minutes per day.
4. Approximately 2 hours per day.
5. More than 2 hours per day.

Should reading time/instruction be divided up?

1. No--reading instruction should take place at one sitting.
2. Yes--reading instruction should be divided into two or more periods.
3. Yes--periods of reading instruction should be interspersed with time for students to practice their skills.

What type of school facilities are important?

1. Modern, new buildings; physically appealing.
2. Buildings with flexible space (e.g., large rooms with dividers for ease in making smaller spaces).
3. Special reading laboratories or resource centers.
4. Facilities for utilizing the latest in educational technology.

What should the school climate be?

1. Strong emphasis on discipline.
2. Quiet and orderly.
3. Sense of pride in the school in students and faculty and parents.
4. Structured (for those children who need it).
5. Permissive (for those children who can handle it).

How should students' reading ability be evaluated?

1. Individually--at the end of each reading assignment (by the page or by the book).
2. By locally developed reading diagnostic tests.
3. By commercially produced tests geared to a single curriculum in use by the school.
4. By standardized, mass-administered reading tests.

Who should be made aware of evaluation results for subsequent use?

1. Classroom teachers.
2. "Cluster" teachers (regular teachers assigned to assist with a group of classrooms).
3. Reading/speech specialists.
4. Trained paraprofessional teacher aides.
5. Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides.
6. Administrators.
7. Special projects personnel.
8. Parents and the community.

• Mathematics Programs

There are many questions which need to be answered about mathematics programs. The questions below ask about the who, what, when, where, why, and how of these programs and the relative levels of student mathematics achievement they are able to produce.

What is the goal of mathematics programs?

1. Students will raise their mathematics achievement scores each year.
2. Students will achieve a greater increase in their scores each year.
3. Students will gain one year in their scores for each year in class.
4. Students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group.

Who should teach mathematics?

1. Classroom teachers.
2. "Cluster" teachers (regular teachers assigned to assist with a group of classrooms).
3. Trained paraprofessional teacher aides.
4. Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides.

What characteristics influence the effectiveness of mathematics teachers?

1. Sex.
2. Age.
3. Experience.
4. Academic preparation.
5. Background in mathematics teaching methods and theories.
6. Salary.

7. Employment status.

8. Job satisfaction.

9. General intelligence.

10. Verbal ability.

11. Critical reading ability.

12. Expectations for the students.

13. Teacher's self-concept.

14. Ethnic background.

15. Ethnic similarity to students.

16. Knowledge of students' culture/linguistic background.

17. Match of teachers' and students' cognitive styles.

18. Overall quality of teacher.

19. Stability of staff.

What type of administrators have a positive influence on mathematics programs?

1. Those who are stable in their position.

2. Those who retain all the authority in the school.

3. Those who delegate authority to assistants (especially with instructional capabilities and backgrounds).

4. Those who provide support and assistance for the teaching staff.

5. Those who mandate a well outlined and designed mathematics program plan.

6. Those who are directly connected with the implementation and/or design of the mathematics program plan.

7. Those who keep in direct touch with the classroom (through formal and informal visits).

For what grade levels are mathematics programs (compensatory) appropriate?

1. Preschool.

2. Primary.

3. Intermediate.
4. Junior high.
5. Senior high.
6. Community college or trade school.
7. College or university.
8. Adult night schools.

What instructional methods should be used?

1. Systematic instruction with immediate, quality feedback.
2. Positive reinforcement and praise when appropriate.
3. Peer tutoring (children of the same age).
4. Peer tutoring (older with younger children).
5. Stress on mathematics achievement (e.g., discussion of mathematics problems and concepts).
6. Teaching bilingual children in their native language first.
7. Teaching bilingual children in English first.
8. Assigning homework on a regular basis.
9. Framing instructional activities to be carried out in the home with the help of the child's family.
10. Television instruction.
11. Techniques of involving students in discussions in class.
12. Use of teacher-directed/structure/centered activities.
13. Use of student-centered ("self-directed") activities.
14. Team teaching.
15. Use of questioning appropriate for students (e.g., factual or higher level).
16. Mobility in the classroom while teaching.
17. High rate of drill and practice.

What should the content of mathematics programs be?

1. "New" math.
2. "Old" math.
3. Discussions of why learning mathematics is important/rewarding.
4. Relating mathematics skills to other courses in the curriculum.
5. Test-taking skills.
6. Memorization of mathematics "facts" (e.g., multiplication tables).
7. Word problems.
8. Computational skills.
9. Inductive reasoning.
10. Deductive reasoning.
11. Use of calculators.
12. Use of computers.
13. Practical mathematics.
14. Theoretical, abstract mathematics.
15. Career education information.

What materials should be utilized in mathematics instruction?

1. Culturally non-biased traditional materials.
2. Materials with cultural content.
3. A variety and quantity of textbooks.
4. One predominantly used textbook or series.
5. Multi-level materials.
6. Materials from classroom and school libraries for use in the classroom or at home.
7. Textbooks with programmed workbooks.
8. Machine-programmed materials.
9. Individualized learning activities.

10. Montessori materials.

11. Cuisenaire rods.

How should students be grouped for mathematics instruction?

1. No grouping--individualized instruction only.
2. Small groups (up to 15).
3. Large groups (more than 15).
4. Ethnically homogeneous groups.
5. Ethnically heterogeneous groups.
6. Achievement (mathematics performance) groups.
7. Ability (general intelligence) groups.

How much school time should be devoted to mathematics instruction?

1. Approximately 30 minutes per day.
2. Approximately 1 hour per day.
3. Approximately 90 minutes per day.
4. Approximately 2 hours per day.
5. More than 2 hours per day.

Should mathematics time/instruction be divided up?

1. No--mathematics instruction should take place at one sitting.
2. Yes--mathematics instruction should be divided into two or more periods.
3. Yes--periods of mathematics instruction should be interspersed with time for students to practice their skills.

What type of school facilities are important?

1. Modern, new buildings; physically appealing.
2. Buildings with flexible space (e.g., large rooms with dividers for ease in making smaller spaces).
3. Special mathematics laboratories or resource centers.
4. Facilities for utilizing the latest in educational technology.

What should the school climate be?

1. Strong emphasis on discipline.
2. Quiet and orderly.
3. Sense of pride in the school in students and faculty and parents.
4. Structured (for those children who need it).
5. Permissive (for those children who can handle it).

How should students' mathematics ability be evaluated?

1. Individually--at the end of each mathematics assignment (by the page or by the unit).
2. By locally developed mathematics diagnostic tests.
3. By commercially produced tests geared to a single curriculum in use by the school.
4. By standardized, mass-administered mathematics tests.

Who should be made aware of evaluation results for subsequent use?

1. Classroom teachers.
2. "Cluster" teachers (regular teachers assigned to assist with a group of classrooms).
3. Trained paraprofessional teacher aides.
4. Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides.
5. Administrators.
6. Special projects personnel.
7. Parents and the community.

- Inservice Teacher Training

There are many questions which need to be answered about inservice teacher training. Should inservice training be university-based or school-based? Who should design the inservice programs? What is the best approach to use? Who should conduct the training? Where should the training be held? When should the inservice programs take place? What should the content be? How should teachers be compensated for their participation?

Should inservice training be university-based or school-based?

1. University-based only.
2. School-based only.
3. A combination of university-based and school-based.
4. Either university-based or school-based, depending on the circumstances.

Who should design the inservice programs?

1. School district and administrative personnel.
2. College and university faculty members.
3. Teachers themselves.
4. Parents and community members.
5. Students.

What is the best approach to use?

1. Independent study.
2. Self-instructional materials.
3. Printed/audio-visual packaged materials.
4. Seminars.
5. Workshops.
6. Demonstration teaching.
7. Observation and evaluation of classroom teaching.
8. Discussions with students, community representatives, and parents.
9. Trips and visits.
10. Courses at nearby institutions of higher education.

Who should conduct the training?

1. Teacher-leaders selected by the school staff.
2. Master teachers identified for their effectiveness in the classroom.
3. School/district administrators.
4. Outside consultants.
5. College and university professors.

Where should the training be held?

1. On-site in the schools.
2. At teacher education centers.
3. In the nearby colleges and universities.

When should the inservice programs take place?

1. Before school.
2. During school within contractual agreements.

3. After school.
4. Evenings.
5. Weekends.
6. Summer.

What should their content be?

1. Discussing current critical issues.
2. Teaching methods.
3. Interpersonal relations.
4. Investigating new curricula.
5. Developing/modifying new curricula.
6. Using educational technology.
7. Planning/instituting educational change.
8. Testing and evaluating students or materials.
9. Establishing educational goals.
10. Writing student behavioral objectives.
11. Investigating special education techniques and approaches.
12. Diagnosing learning problems.
13. Using teacher aides effectively.
14. Utilizing the physical space in the school.
15. Investigating new methods of scheduling school time.
16. Utilizing varied methods of grouping students.

How should teachers be compensated for their participation?

1. Teachers should participate on a voluntary basis.
2. Teachers should be given release time.
3. Teachers should be given stipends for attending.
4. Teachers should be given stipends for completion of useful

products/research.

5. Teachers should be given inservice credit toward salary differentials.

• Parent/Community Involvement

There are many questions which need to be answered about parent/community involvement. Should parents/the community be involved in the schools at all? Should they only advise the professionals or perform real duties? What organizational structures are most suitable for them? What activities are most suitable for them? What methods should be used to elicit parental/community response?

Should parents/the community be involved in the schools at all?

Parents	Community
1. Yes	1. Yes
2. No	2. No

Should parents/the community only advise the professionals or perform real duties?

Parents	Community
1. Advise only	1. Advise only
2. Perform only	2. Perform only
3. Advise and perform	3. Advise and perform

What organizational structures are most suitable for parents/community members?

Parents Advisors	Community Advisors
1. Districtwide advisory council	1. Districtwide advisory council
2. Regionwide/areawide advisory council	2. Regionwide/areawide advisory council
3. School advisory council	3. School advisory council
4. Parent/community members--school personnel committees	4. Parent/community members--school personnel committees
5. PTA	5. PTA
6. Classroom ("room mothers/fathers") committees	6. Classroom ("room mothers/fathers") committees

Parents	Community
Performers	Performers
7. School board	7. School board
8. Districtwide activity coordinators	8. Districtwide activity coordinators
9. Regionwide/areawide activity coordinators	9. Regionwide/areawide activity coordinators
10. School activity coordinators	10. School activity coordinators
11. Parent/community members--school personnel committees	11. Parent/community members--school personnel committees
12. PTA	12. PTA
13. Classroom ("room mothers/fathers") committees	13. Classroom ("room mothers/fathers") committees
14. Paraprofessional staff members	14. Paraprofessional staff members
15. Home tutors	15. Home tutors

What activities are most suitable for parents/community members?

Parents	Community
1. Stay informed of district/region/school affairs and provide general consultation	1. Stay informed of district/region/school affairs and provide general consultation
2. Review and improve important school documents and policy statements	2. Review and improve important school documents and policy statements
3. Serve as an independent fact-finding group and make appropriate recommendations	3. Serve as an independent fact-finding group and make appropriate recommendations
4. Advise school personnel on daily instructional activities and special programs	4. Advise school personnel on daily instructional activities and special programs
5. Discuss pertinent educational issues with other parents/community members, individually or in group meetings	5. Discuss pertinent educational issues with other parents/community members, individually or in group meetings

Parents	Community
6. Set instructional goals and objectives for students	6. Set instructional goals and objectives for students
7. Set performance requirements for students	7. Set performance requirements for students
8. Assist in conducting district/region/school needs assessments	8. Assist in conducting district/region/school needs assessments
9. Plan special programs for the district/region/school	9. Plan special programs for the district/region/school
10. Assist in designing teacher/administrator inservice courses	10. Assist in designing teacher/administrator inservice courses
11. Assist in designing workshops for laypersons interested in becoming involved with the schools	11. Assist in designing workshops for laypersons interested in becoming involved with the schools
12. Serve as guest speakers in assemblies or individual classrooms	12. Serve as guest speakers in assemblies or individual classrooms
13. Assist in daily instructional activities as volunteer aides/tutors	13. Assist in daily instructional activities as volunteer aides/tutors
14. Assist in daily instructional activities as paid aides/tutors	14. Assist in daily instructional activities as paid aides/tutors
15. Tutor students in their homes	15. Tutor students in their homes

What methods should be used to elicit parental/community response and participation?

Parents	Community
1. Home visits	1. Home visits
2. Financial incentives	2. Financial incentives
3. Workshops	3. Workshops

Parents	Community
4. Inservice staff training	4. Inservice staff training
5. Media campaign	5. Media campaign
6. Telephone interviews	6. Telephone interviews
7. Mass mailings	7. Mass mailings
8. Adult education	8. Adult education

Optimum School Level for Intervention

There has been considerable research and debate as to the optimum school level for compensatory education intervention.

What is the optimum school level for intervention?

1. Pre-school level.
2. Early elementary school level.
3. Secondary school level.
4. Early elementary school/secondary school combination.
5. Adult level.

APPENDIX C

List of Policy Questions Posed by Officials Interviewed

Policy Questions Posed by Officials Interviewed

1. What kinds of compensatory instructional practices work best in the majority of programs?

2. What are the relative merits of employing more fully-qualified professionals vs. employing paraprofessional aides?

3. What are the relative merits of programmed learning vs. non-programmed learning?

4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of using unpaid volunteers to assist in the community, in the schools, and in the classrooms?

5. Should the role of parents and members of the community be limited to setting goals for compensatory programs or should they participate as staff members in actually operating the programs?

6. What should the goals of compensatory programs be? Should they attempt to improve basic skills and other aspects of academic learning or should they attempt to improve students' attitudes toward themselves, toward school, and toward learning? If both cannot be accomplished, which is more important?

7. To what extent do presently available, widely recognized, generally respected intruments such as objective tests of student achievement actually measure the outcomes of compensatory programs?

8. Does the current "back to basics" movement threaten compensatory education programs by causing them to de-emphasize other important aspects of learning?

9. Why are the schools doing an excellent job of teaching basic skills such as reading up through grade 4 or 5 but doing a mediocre or poor job thereafter? Can this pattern be attributed to shifts in school instructional practices or attributed instead to outside social forces (such as changing patterns of family life) which counteract what the school is trying to accomplish?

10. How can the learning gains obtained in early compensatory programs be maintained during later years of schooling?

11. Should compensatory education programs be targeted to specific populations such as black Americans, Indian Americans, Hispanic Americans or bilingual populations rather than being designed as general-purpose treatments for all disadvantaged populations?

12. What have we learned from compensatory education programs that can be generalized to other populations which are not disadvantaged?

13. Are compensatory funds being distributed in the optimum proportions over various aspects of instruction? For example, is the 61% now being spent to teach reading the optimum proportion compared to what is being spent on other aspects of basic skills instruction?

14. Would it be better to have compensatory funds assigned to individual students rather than to the institutions they attend so that when the highly mobile disadvantaged students move to new locations, compensatory funds would automatically move with them?

15. Has the Federal role in compensatory alleviated or aggravated public concern about educational issues such as those identified in the recent Gallup Poll conducted for the Kettering Foundation? Many parents said in that poll that the schools should give more attention to basic skills, tighten up discipline, meet needs of individual students, improve parent-school relations, emphasize moral development, and stress career education--specific concerns within a larger belief by a heavy majority that the quality of education is declining.

16. Does parent and/or community involvement in compensatory programs help student achievement in basic skills or in academic studies?

17. What is the best form of parent or community involvement? For example, what are the relative merits of having one or a few highly articulate, aggressive parents tell school officials what "the community" thinks, versus having large numbers of less articulate, less aggressive parents and community members speak for themselves?

18. Do the National Advisory Councils which guide compensatory education programs have any constructive effect, either on their operations or on their outcomes?

19. What can be learned by contrasting programs, such as FOLLOW THROUGH with typical ESEA Title I programs?

20. Are the Federal management requirements incorporated into the ESEA Title I justified either because they 1) give the program identifiable boundaries, or, 2) are positively related to student learning outcomes?

    Sample requirements:

    a. Local school districts must use ESEA Title I funds to supplement rather than to supplant local funds.

    b. Only certain students are eligible for ESEA Title I assistance.

21. Are the Federal instructional requirements incorporated into the ESEA Title I guidelines (some rooted in the authorizing statutes and some rooted in viewpoints about instruction) positively related to student learning?

    Sample instructional requirements:

    a. Eligible students are to be brought up to the average achievement level for their age (rather than for their grade).

b. Should "disadvantaged" mean coming from a low income family, low academic achievement in relation to age, or low achievement in relation to grade? Or should it be defined as some combination?

c. If poverty students have one normal distribution of achievement and non-poverty students have another normal distribution of achievement, the two distributions probably overlap, with poverty high-achievers at the same level as non-poverty low achievers. Should the non-poverty low achievers be declared ineligible for compensatory programs?

d. ESEA Title I began by selecting students at the very bottom of the ability and achievement distribution for compensatory attention. The limited potential of many such students tended to doom compensatory programs to limited success. Would it have been wiser to concentrate on more capable students--say those just below average in achievement--and lift them up to or above the average?

e. Low-achieving disadvantaged students who rise to an average achievement level are eliminated from the program. Would it be better to educate disadvantaged children to their full potential, taking them far beyond average if they were qualified, and thus eventually raising the achievement of the poverty group to overlap completely the achievement of the non-poverty group? Why is "average" good enough for the disadvantaged if they have the potential for doing better?

f. Would it be wise to select extremely high potential disadvantaged students and move them up to very high levels of achievement so that they would become leaders for the nation?

g. The present rule which eliminates students from compensatory programs when they achieve at the average for their age means that some students, partially because of forgetting over the summer months or simply a return to a slower rate of learning during a year without compensatory help, fall below average and thus become eligible to re-enter the program. The pattern of entry, exit, re-entry, and re-exit can become chronic for some children. Is this a good policy?

23. The population of compensatory education students is extremely fluid for three reasons:

a. Students cross back and forth over the eligibility threshold, qualifying for compensatory instruction, learning enough to disqualify themselves, and then forgetting enough to qualify themselves again.

b. Disadvantaged families tend to be highly mobile, moving from one school neighborhood to another within the same school district.

c. Disadvantaged families tend to be highly mobile, moving from school district to school district.

The effect of this is to produce erratic services for individual students.

Would it be better for compensatory programs to use the FOLLOW THROUGH model of retaining students in the program for a number of years irrespective of their rising achievement?

24. When evaluators make a cross-sectional study examining the progress of compensatory education students from grade to grade (rather than longitudinal studies following a cohort of identical students from grade to grade), the measures are taken from different groups of students who have had different kinds of compensatory instruction in varying amounts at irregular times in a variety of schools. The findings from such studies yield misleading conclusions about the effects of compensatory programs.

Moreover, the policy of moving students out of compensatory programs when they reach the average achievement threshold and replacing them by students further down the achievement ladder, means that successful students are not available to be tested when cross-sectional studies are made in future years. Thus, the results yield misleading conclusions about program effects. That is, the observed effect is that test scores do not improve from year to year, whereas the cause is that students who have high scores are removed from the program and replaced with students who have low scores.

Even longitudinal studies cannot solve this problem fully because students who rise to an average level are removed from the program and deprived of further help. Including them in a test cohort includes students who are no longer receiving compensatory assistance.

25. Each of the compensatory education programs and products approved by the USOE/NIE Joint Dissemination Review Panel makes a number of instructional assertions. That is, each program and product embodies a number of instructional design decisions about how to educate disadvantaged students.

Each of those explicit and implicit assertions should be treated as a hypothesis, given the fact that even the programs and products approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel lack conclusive evidence as to their superiority. That will yield a large number of instructional hypotheses of great concern to those responsible for compensatory education.

Policy makers can be thought of as asking: "Are the assertions made by the approved programs and products true and reliable?"

26. What is the validity of the "intensity of effort" concept which governs compensatory education programs today?

By 1968, it was becoming clear that compensatory programs did not make enormous differences in student achievement. Partly in reaction, some leaders proposed that it would be necessary to dedicate a "critical mass" of money and effort for the compensatory education of each disadvantaged student in order to make a significant difference. A figure of $300 per pupil was suggested. (In 1968, that would have been roughly a 33 1/3% increase over the approximately $900 per pupil being spent by schools each year). The $300 figure has persisted until 1976 even though it constitutes today only about 25% of the $1,200 per pupil schools currently spend each year.

The effect of the "intensity of effort" policy--which has no empirical data to support it and which there is counter-evidence to challenge--means that fewer students can be served with the funds available. That is, more students could be reached at a lower cost per pupil if the "intensity of effort" requirement were dropped. What would be the gains and losses from such a policy shift in terms of achievement among various groups of disadvantaged students?

Some disadvantaged students go unserved under this policy while others are well-served. What would be the net effect on learning for the total group under a policy shift? Under which policy would the total learning gain of participating students best offset the learning loss of non-participating students? To put it another way, how can total learning be maximized? Or should every student be given some compensatory instruction, even if total learning gain is not maximized thereby?

27. How could compensatory funds best be distributed over students who are at various points along the learning scale?

28. Should disadvantaged students be moved out of their neighborhoods for compensatory instruction if order to break cultural patterns, value patterns, and language patterns which inhibit learning?

29. The needs assessments published as a part of ESEA Title I proposals constitute a long roster of policy concerns. How can the needs of disadvantaged students, as described in the needs assessments, be best met? (This source would supplement checking the explicit and implicit assertions made in the programs and products cleared by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel).

30. Does compensatory education work at all?

31. Does any particular form of compensatory education work better than any other form?

32. What is the minimum length of compensatory treatment required for higher student achievement to be sustained over a long period of time?

33. Most of the programs and products approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel require separating disadvantaged students from other students in order to instruct them. What are the relative merits of such separation versus "mainstreaming" disadvantaged students and instructing them simultaneously with advantaged students?

34. Does the race or ethnic composition of the faculty matter in a compensatory education program?

35. How significant is the pupil-teacher ratio in compensatory programs?

36. How should the special, separate compensatory experiences provided for disadvantaged students be correlated with the regular curriculum which they experience during the remainder of the school day?

37. How should teachers be trained to handle the smaller classes they have during the hours when disadvantaged students are taken out as individuals or small groups for compensatory instruction?

38. How should eligibility requirements for compensatory education programs be determined?

39. What are the effects on achievement of one set of eligibility requirements versus another for various groups of students?

40. If disadvantaged students are "mainstreamed", what is the optimum ratio of disadvantaged to advantaged students in such settings?

41. Can compensatory programs be effective if operated during the regular school day in the normal school environment? (Consider the alternative: assume that a disadvantaged child were placed in an advantaged home at a very early age and that by age 5 the child would be indistinguishable from a child born in an advantaged home. We would then have a successful treatment. Can any program operated during normal school hours in the regular school environment achieve the same effect?)

42. If we can design and operate such effective programs, can they be designed and operated so that their effects are both *sustained* over long periods of time and are *cumulative* from year to year? (Some current research suggests that the effect of compensatory programs is to prevent the characteristic *widening* of the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students during the years of schooling. The initial gap is not closed; neither is it widened. This suggests that compensatory instructional effects are both sustained and cumulative. But will such findings be confirmed by other studies?)

43. If the answers to the two previous questions are yes, is it

possible to isolate, package, and disseminate the elements of effective compensatory programs?

44. What is the relationship, if any, between program cost and program effectiveness? (The programs approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel cover the entire range in cost: some cost virtually nothing more than a regular program, while others entail very high additional costs--yet every program approved by the Panel had to provide evidence of effectiveness as a condition of approval.)

45. What are the soundest theoretical grounds for compensatory education--principles which could be used to guide the design and operation of programs?

46. What is the optimum variety of persons serving as trainers of teachers of the disadvantaged?

47. What are the relative responsibilities of school districts to provide inservice training and of individual professionals to pursue their own continuing education?

48, What contribution can teachers' centers make in training teachers for compensatory programs?

49. What kinds of compensatory programs are most likely to cause disadvantaged students to remain in school rather than dropping out?

50. What is the effect of compensatory programs on teachers' attitudes toward teaching disadvantaged students?

51. What characteristics of compensatory programs are associated with their being continued after funds are withdrawn or expanded after funds are stablized?

52. How can parent/community involvement, which is a common feature of compensatory programs, be maintained and expanded in the face of collective bargaining, which tends to deprive parents and community members of genuine influence over what goes on in schools?

53. Are compensatory programs more effective at changing teachers' attitudes toward disadvantaged students than in increasing the academic achievement of such students?

54. What kinds of compensatory programs are most likely to deliver services to their primary target populations such as students rather than benefiting other less important populations such as paraprofessionals?

55. Should Federal compensatory education guidelines contain any requirements for teacher training? (ESEA Title I has no requirements for teacher training.)

56. Is there a repertoire of promising inservice teacher training techniques for teachers in compensatory programs?

57. Do teachers in compensatory programs need inservice training?

58. What are the merits of having teachers trained by other teachers in cases when the trainers are not much more capable than the trainees?

59. How do the inservice training needs of teachers in compensatory programs differ according to the quality of their pre-service training?

60. How should professional associations of teachers participate in designing inservice teacher training?

61. What would be the effects of a full-fledged, well-financed compensatory education program extending over a period of ten years?

62. Do outcomes differ among compensatory programs which assume that children can learn versus those which assume that they cannot learn or can learn only with great difficulty?

63. What part does pride in the school program on the part of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and the community play in the success of a compensatory program?

64. The specific program features in a school like Baneker in St. Louis constitute a set of assertions about good compensatory instruction which could be converted into hypotheses to be investigated.

65. What is the optimum configuration of trainers (professors, experienced teachers, parents, community representatives, students) for teachers in compensatory programs?

66. What is the best content for compensatory education teacher training programs?

67. What are the best methods to teach in compensatory education teacher training programs?

68. Who should decide whether or not teachers need inservice training in order to work in compensatory programs? Should teachers decide? Should administrators decide? Should the community decide?

69. How should teachers be compensated by school systems for taking part in inservice training?

70. How should compensatory programs be financed so that outside funding will supplement rather than supplant local funding, thus

insuring an increase in the number of teachers or in the salaries of existing teachers?

71. How can inservice training be made an integral part of each teacher's job rather than a separate, additional obligation or experience?

APPENDIX D

List of Officials Interviewed

USOE Officials

Dr. William Pierce
Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education
U.S. Office of Education
Room 4181
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-8795

Dr. Robert Wheeler
Deputy Commissioner of School Systems
U.S. Office of Education
Room 4111
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-8720

Dr. John Rodriguez
Associate Commissioner Compensatory Education Programs
U.S. Office of Education
Room 2189
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-8626

Dr. John Evans
Acting Deputy Commissioner for Planning
Assistant Commissioner--Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation
U.S. Office of Education
Room 4079
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-8844

Association Officials

Dr. Carl Marburger
Senior Associate
National Committee for Citizens and Education
Suite 410
Wilde Lake Village Green
Columbia, Maryland 21044
(301) 997-9300

Mr. Carl Holman
President
Urban Coalition
Suite 400
1201 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20008
(202) 331-2400

Dr. Byron Hansford
Executive Secretary
Council of Chief State School Officers
Room 301
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-4192

Dr. Edward Pomeroy
Executive Director
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Suite 610
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-2450

Dr. Owen Kiernan
Executive Secretary
National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22070
(703) 860-0200

Dr. Edward Keller
Deputy Executive Director
National Association of Elementary School Principals
4th Floor
1801 North Moore Street
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209
(703) 528-5627

Dr. John Sullivan
Director, Instructional and Professional Development
National Education Association
Room 714
1201 16th Street, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 997-9300

Ms. Eugenia Kemble
Executive Secretary
American Federation of Teachers
5th Floor
11 Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. William Simons
President
District of Columbia Public Schools Teachers' Union
Suite 508
1150 17th Street, NW
Washington, D C. 20036
(202) 452-8120

School of Education Officials

Dr. Robert Egbert
Dean
School of Education
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
(402) 472-3569

NIE Officials

Dr. Paul Hill
Chief of Compensatory Education
Education Equity Group--National Institute of Education
Room 808
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20208
(202) 254-5830

APPENDIX H

Verification of Key Policy Questions in the RFP

Key Policy Questions in the RFP

TOPIC A: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. Which approach to in-service training will generate the greatest increase in the number and level of teacher competencies in reading and mathematics:

   a. Having teachers trained by on-site trainers, as is the case with PENP?

   b. Utilizing external consultants who help teachers follow a specific program?

   c. Enrolling teachers in training courses at colleges and universities?

   d. Having external consultants provide in-service training?

   e. Developing district teaching centers?

Intended Audiences

The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education

The National Education Association

The American Federation of Teachers

Local teachers' associations

Local school boards

Local superintendents of schools

State legislators

Congressional sub-committees concerned with staff development

Source

> "Effective in-service education is likely to result from a 'programmatic development' approach. Such an approach is defined by this author as in-service activity which emerges from an operational complex which has demonstrated the capability to create and/or diffuse instructional programs targetted to a group of teachers with particular needs. In this article, three approaches which fit the criterion are described:

1. In-service education as a programmatic activity of teacher education centers,

2. In-service education as a product of specialized curriculum and instructional product/training centers, and

3. In-service education as disseminated through specialized workshops."

Marvin Pasch. Programmatic Development of In-Service Teacher Education. pp. 1-2.

TOPIC B: BENEFITS FOR STUDENTS AND COMMUNITY

2. Which strategy is more likely to reduce the achievement gap between inner city students and other students in reading and mathematics as measured by standardized achievement tests, and to increase student attendance and retention:

   a. Training classroom teachers in specific competencies related to reading and math, as is the case in RENP?

   b. Utilizing reading specialists to work with students?

   c. Hiring external consultants to work directly with students?

Source

> "There seems to be eight factors that are common to the four successful schools that are usually not present in unsuccessful inner-city schools. These are--not, of course, in the order of their importance--strong leadership, high expectations, good atmosphere, strong emphasis on reading, additional reading personnel, use of phonics, individualization, and careful evaluation of pupil progress."
>
> George Weber. Inner City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. pp. 25-26.

3. Which intervention point in compensatory education programs is more likely to achieve the largest and most durable effects on student achievement in reading and mathematics:

   a. Intervening in the early elementary school years (grade 1-3)?

   b. Intervening in the late elementary school years (grades 4-6)?

   c. Intervening in the early secondary school years (grades 7-8)?

   d. Intervening in the late secondary school years (grades 9-12) ?

Source

"The view of intellectual development advanced

> here suggests that attempts to increase the autonomous cognitive competence of students are more likely to succeed if they are delayed, for many children until near the end of the elementary school years. The view also suggests that the probability that such efforts will succeed can be further increased by a) designing explicit instruction to promote the acquisition of autonomous intellectual skills and b) by evaluating student progress and instructional effectiveness directly in terms of performances that display those skills rather than in terms of performances that demonstrate the acquisition and retention of prescribed, discipline-oriented content."
>
> William D. Rohwer, Jr. "Prime Time for Education." Harvard Educational Review, August 1971. pp. 336-337.

4. Which strategy for involving and informing parents and community members in and about the education of children is most likely to lead to substantial increases in parent/community knowledge about the schools and to greater involvement in the education of the children:

   a. Actively involving parents in the decision-making process?

   b. Having parents serve as members of the educational staff and training parents as educators of their own children as well as providing support services for parents, as is the case in RENP?

   c. A more direct kind of income transfer strategy such as paying parents for their training and attendance at meetings?

Source

> "SEA and OE regional officials generally believed LEAs needed to extensively increase parental involvement in their Title I programs. SEA officials made several suggestions on how to do this, such as constant surveillance by the SEA or payments to parents for attending meetings. One SEA official thought LEAs should provide more inservice training on how to get parents involved. Another SEA official suggested that OE change its guidelines to require that a parent advisory council be organized at each target school instead of requiring only one council for an entire LEA because:
>
> --Parents are concerned primarily with their

own children rather than all children in the LEA.

--Some parents may feel out of place among the professionals at an LEA-wide meeting.

--LEA-wide meetings are too far removed from the particular school where a parent has his or her child."

Assessment of Reading Activites Funded Under the Federal Program of Aid for Educationally Deprived Children. Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, 1975. pp. 37-38.

Intended Audiences

Teachers' professional organizations

Local school boards

Associations of school principals

Congressional sub-committees concerned with Federal support for elementary and secondary education

TOPIC C: ANALYSIS OF RESOURCES REQUIRED AND ASSOCIATED COSTS

5. What is the most effective way of spending money to increase teacher competencies in reading and math, to increase student achievement in these areas, and to increase parent/community knowledge and involvement:

   a. Utilizing strategies of teacher training by on-site trainers and parental training by community organizers, as is the case with RENP?

   b. Allocating dollars directly to parents and paying for externally delivered services to teachers?

Intended Audiences

DCPS Superintendent of Schools

DCPS Director of Instruction

Local school boards

Associations of school principals

Congressional sub-committees conerned with Federal support for elementary and secondary education

Source

> "Reviews of compensatory education programs indicate that increased funding for compensatory education cannot in itself be effective unless teachers are trained in appropriate techniques. Programs that provide reading material or a week or two of general training are usually ineffective. More intensive training on procedures for diagnosing student needs and planning appropriate curricula apparently is needed; however, few compensatory programs include this type of instruction for teachers. Further, getting good ideas and practices from research to the classroom continues to be a serious problem in these programs. Teacher training should be developed that maximizes the chance that teachers will deploy the new techniques."

Review of Research Relevant to the Response to Educational Needs Project. Draft. Compiled by David I. Falk, August 9, 1974. p. 17.

> "One LEA successfully increased parental Before school year 1972-73, this LEA had poor parental involvement, primarily because it had made only limited efforts to stimulate parental interest. In preparing for the 1972-73 school year, the LEA intensified its efforts by making home visits, submitting the title I application to the parent advisory council for its review and approval, and asking the council to become involved in assessing needs. Parent interest and involvement in the LEA's program increased."

Assessment of Reading Activities Funded Under the Federal Program of Aid for Educationally Deprived Children. Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, 1975. p. 37.

TOPIC D: THE HISTORICAL STUDY

6. Which method of organizing social and political forces to develop a program is most likely to lead to desirable outcomes in the increase of teacher competencies, the increase of basic skill levels, and an increase in parental/community knowledge and involvement:

   a. Exerting pressure on Congress and Federal education agencies by marshaling massive community support for a project, as is the case with RENP?

   b. Having the community hire professional consultants to assist in writing proposals for Federal support?

   c. Organizing the community to generate on its own a proposal to seek Federal funds?

Intended Audiences

Congressional sub-committees concerned with Federal support of elementary and secondary education

Local school districts

Local community groups

Organizations concerned with broad policy issues regarding the Federal role in education

Source

> "Creation of countervailing local forces to prod federal, state, and local officials to act more forcefully may be the most important step. Efforts to establish strong local parent advisory councils under the new federal guidelines could help produce more local responsiveness to the educational needs of the poor. Their demands for public acountability and a role in the development of programs could increase the influence of the poor at the local level. But if strong local councils are an important first step, greater organizing efforts aimed at the state and federal levels are also necessary. In Massachusetts, for example, the State Welfare Rights Organization, community action agencies, the Harvard Center for Law and Education, and other groups have recently banded together to encourage the Department to issue strong guidelines governing local councils. On October 23, 1970, Massachusetts approved the most far-reaching

guidelines of any in the country. They require each school district to set up election procedures immediately for as many parent councils as necessary to ensure representation from every Title I school. Furthermore, the guidelines provide local advisory council chairmen with the right of appeal to the State Commissioner of Education on questions of Title I implementation. Such pressure may result not only in the establishment of local councils, but also in the strengthening of the state's bargaining position with local school districts. No longer will the state be totally beholden to the wishes of local public schoolmen.

Similarly, community groups could band together on a nationwide basis, to bring pressure to bear on USOE and the Congress. Until recently, whenever USOE attempted to exert any influence, the only people they heard from were spokesmen for public educators trying to protect their own interests; typically USOE responded positively to this constituency. In the last few months, as we have seen, pressure has been coming from such groups as the Washington Research Project, the NAACP, the National Welfare Rights Organization, and they have had some success. But additional organization will probably be needed if such pressure is going to have a significant long term effect; many more poor will have to be organized for national pressure. In fact, chances of success may be greatest at the national level. Federal officials share with poor parents the distinction of being on the outside of our nation's school system. Assuming that some desire for reform remains in USOE, it is not inconceivable that it could work with the poor on some issues to force change on recalcitrant public school systems. For example, USOE and the poor probably have a mutual interest in increasing public school accountability for Title I. USOE has never used its broad authority to require good evaluation at the local level. Given a strong push by an effective lobby, USOE would be in a better bargaining position to impose this priority on public school educators."

Jerome T. Murphy. "Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Education Reform." Harvard Educational Review, February, 1971. pp. 61-62.

TOPIC E: THE CHANGE AGENT STUDY

7. Which change agent strategy requiring a large amount of Federal dollars to be spent in a manner consistent with local needs and to achieve goals important to the community and to the Federal government is most likely to generate the greatest positive educational reform:

   a. The strategy of having on-site trainers of teachers community organizers, as is the case with RENP?

   b. Strategies such as those adopted by the NIE local problem solving group?

Source

> "If, given a receptive institutional setting, a project's outcomes depend critically on local decisions about how the project will be implemented, federal policymakers might consider ways of encouraging mutual adaptation strategies which we believe are the key to effective implementation.
>
> It would not be easy to develop and carry out policies to encourage mutual adaptation. We found that attempts to provide outside aid or prescribe management techniques were usually counterproductive, leading to nonimplementation or cooptation. On one hand, outside experts were typically ignored as being too abstract or too unaware of local problems. On the other hand, local staffs sometimes relied so heavily on technical assistance that they were unable to adapt project materials and methods to their own needs and thus they were unable to learn by doing. Similarly, the packaged management approaches we observed tended either to be dismissed as unworkable or to be viewed as complete road maps to innovation, in which case project participants failed to develop the flexibility to cope with unanticipated problems.
>
> Such efforts to help districts innovate seem to be motivated, in part, by interest in fiscal efficency and in accelerating the innovative process. Outside assistance may produce savings under certain conditions, but our research suggests that innovation is by its nature a costly and time-consuming process. Attempts to speed up the process or to reduce its costs may achieve sort-term efficency at the expense of long-term benefits. For example, we observed cases in which districts

hoped to shorten the start-up period and save money by using intensive, "one-shot" pre-service training sessions. Such efforts were largely wasted because the inadequacy of staff members' experience with the project's precepts and problems prevented them from making effective use of the training.

We believe, however, that federal policymakers could formulate administrative guidelines that might support local innovators and state facilitators in the development of an adaptive implementation strategy. Such guidelines could articulate the value of those elements that we found essential to mutual adaptation:

- Continuous and on-line planning
- Regular and frequent staff meetings
- In-service training linked to staff meetings
- Local material development

If these elements are criticized as being time consuming or "inefficient," it is important to remember that the pace of the change process is necessarily slow because people learn by doing.

Federal policy also might assist "learning by doing" by using the present network of regional labs in a revised role. For example, we argued that local material development promoted mutual adaptation; that is, "reinventing the wheel" enables school staff members to adapt project materials to their own needs--an essential step in fostering their commitment to the project. It may be possible for regional labs to shift emphasis away from the preparation of complete packages of curriculum materials to "skeletal" frameworks that allow for and indeed assume development by local staff. In addition, the labs might evolve toward providing practitioner-based on-line assistance to districts that are implementing such skeletal frameworks." *

---

* The Northwest Regional Lab appears to have evolved toward offering practitioner-based assistance.

Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review, April, 1975. Rand Corporation. pp. 25-26.

8. Which change strategy is most effective in positive educational reform:

   a. The "balance of forces" strategy, as is the case with RENP?

   b Improving the existing school system as a whole?

   c. The voucher concept?

   d. Concentrating more power in the hands of teachers through district teacher centers?

   e. Increasing the power of teachers unions?

   f. Providing teachers experimental grants?

Source

> "As noted, the main strategy that emerged in CSIP was an attempt to change the educational structure through a process of teacher development. The program was largely a "professional" approach which can claim great success in changing professional practice, and this is no mean achievement. But these changes in practice were effective only within the existing classroom-oriented parameters of project schools. The limited outcomes of CSIP strongly suggest that a program aspiring to be "comprehensive" must look beyond the manipulation of variables within the school, and reckon more directly with outside factors such as financing, parent expectations, and local social and political pressures. The more fundamental the changes conceived, the more central such issues become."

A Foundation Goes to School. The Ford Foundation Comprehensive School Improvement Program 1960-70, November, 1972. Ford Foundation. pp. 40-41.

Intended Audiences

Congressional sub-committees concerned with the Federal role in elementary and secondary education

Teacher professional organizations

Federal policy makers

LEA organizations concerned where broad policy issues regarding the Federal role in education

APPENDIX F

Questions Not in RFP That Contractor Could Answer

QUESTIONS DERIVED FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Federal and State Administration of Compensatory Education Programs

1. Should the role of parents and members of the community be limited to setting goals for compensatory programs, or should they participate as staff members in actually operating the programs?

2. How should the learning gains, if any, obtained in early compensatory education programs be maintained during later years of schooling? By continued intervention in the later grades? By having certain students extensively tutored by professionals? By training parents to continue tutoring in the home? By some other alternative?

3. How should compensatory education funds be optimally distributed? Should we continue to spend the 61% now being spent to teach reading compared to what is being spent on other aspects of basic skills instruction? Is there another proportion which would generate the same or higher outcomes?

4. Should compensatory education programs stress the "back to basics" approach? Should it emphasize other important areas of learning?

Project Roles/Responsibilities

1. In funding compensatory education programs, should the Federal government limit its role to the awarding and dispensing of funds, should it carefully control the projects use of funds? Should it approve project expenditures? Should it help formulate project goals and objectives? Should it approve all project activities and plans? Should it mandate certain changes and priorities in project plans as needed? Should it provide technical assistance to the projects? Should it insist upon and provide for project evaluation?

2. What should be the role of the local staff in the administration of compensatory education projects? Should it control the projects use of funds? Should it have unilateral responsibility for selecting staff

members? Should it have the primary responsibility for identifying project target populations? Should it be responsible for coordinating the project with regular classroom instruction?

3. How should a compensatory education project be organized? Should it be located within the existing educational organization, using the lay school board as the policy making body? Should it be located outside of the existing educational organization, using a policy making board composed of key administrators?

4. Where should the project be operationally placed within the local school system? Should it be an independent subsystem, working autonomously on the content and process of education? Should it be dispersed throughout the system?

Questions Pertaining to Compensatory Reading Programs

1. Within a compensatory reading program, who should teach reading? Classroom teachers? Trained paraprofessional teacher aides? Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides? What should be the characteristics of administrators who have compensatory reading programs in their school? Should they delegate authority to assistants? Should they provide coutinual support and assistance for the teaching staff? Should they undertake responsibility to outline and design a reading program? Should they be directly concerned with the implementation of the reading program? Should they keep in direct touch with the classroom through formal and informal visits?

2. What kinds of instructional methods should be used? Systematic instruction immediate, quality feedback? Positive reinforcement and praise? Peer tutoring? Stress on reading achievement? Assigning homework on a regular basis? Framing instructional activities to be carried out in the home with the help of a child's family? Techniques of involving students in discussions in class? Use of teacher-directed/structured/centered activities? Use of student-centered activities?

3. What materials should be utilized in reading instruction? Culturally non-biased traditional materials? Materials with culturally content? A variety in quantity of textbooks and story books? Multi-level materials? Materials appropriate to the child's reading level only? Materials from classroom and school libraries for use in the classroom or at home? Stories based on the children's own experiences? Textbooks with program workbooks? Individualized reading series? Audio visual materials?

4. What should the content of compensatory reading programs be? Phonics? The whole-word approach? The sound-symbol approach? Discussions of why learning to read is important and/or rewarding? Relating reading skills to other courses in the curriculum? Test-taking skills? Exercises aimed at general literacy? Exercises tied to specific disciplines? Grammar, sentence structure, and syntax? Reading allowed by the teacher to the students?

5. How should reading instruction be divided during the course of the day? Should it occur all in one sitting? Should it be divided into two or more daily periods? Should it be interspersed with other activites and time allowed for students to practice their skills?

6. How should students be grouped for reading instruction? In small groups? In large groups? In no groups? In no groups, with individualized instruction only? By reading ability?

7. How much school time should be devoted to reading instruction each day? About 30 minutes? About 1 hour? About 90 minutes? About 2 hours? More than 2 hours? In what kinds of school facilities should compensatory reading programs be optimally placed? In modern, new buildings which are physically appealing? In buildings with flexible space? In special reading laboratories or resource centers? In selecting teachers to teach within a compensatory reading program, should program planners look for an optimal mix among variables such as sex, age, experience, academic preparation, extensive background in reading methods and theories, high job satisfaction, teachers' self-concept, teachers' ethnic background, teachers' ethnic similarity to students? Or are there other criteria which program planners should use in selecting teachers? Who should be made aware of evaluation results? Classroom teachers? Reading/speech specialists? Trained paraprofessional teacher aides? Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides? Administrators? Special projects personnel? Parents and the community? Some of the aforementioned? In designing compensatory reading programs, should program planners strive to provide a school climate which has a strong emphasis on discipline? One which is quiet and orderly? One which tries to promote a sense of pride in the school and students and faculty and parents? One which is structures? One which is permissive?

8. How should students' reading ability be evaluated? Individually, at the end of each reading assignment? By locally developed reading diagnostic tests? By use of commercially produced test geared to a single curriculum in use by the school? By standardized, mass-administered reading tests?

9. What should be a realistic goal of compensatory reading programs? That students will raise their reading achievement scores each year? That students will gain one year in their scores for each year in class? That students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group?

Questions Pertaining to Compensatory Programs in Mathematics

1. Who should teach mathematics in a compensatory program? Classroom teachers? Trained paraprofessional teacher aides? Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides?

2. In planning compensatory mathematic programs, what characteristics should program planners look for in administrators? Those who are likely to retain all the authority in the school? Those who are likely to delegate authority to assistants? Those who will provide support and assistance for teaching staff? Those who will mandate a well-outlined and designed mathematics program? Those who will be directly connected with the implementation of the mathematics program? Those who will keep in direct contact with the classroom through formal and informal visits?

3. What instructional methods should be used? Systematic instruction with immediate, quality feedback? Positive reinforcement and praise? Peer tutoring? Stress on mathematics achievement? Assigning homework on a regular basis? Framing instructional acitivities to be carried out in the home with the help of the child's family? Techniques of involving students in discussions in class? Use of teacher-directe structured/centered activities? Use of student-centered activities? Use of questioning appropriate for students? Mobility in the classroom while teaching? High rate of drill and practice?

4. What materials should be used in compensatory mathematics instruction? Culturally non-biased traditional meterials? Materials with cultural content? A variety in quantity of textbooks? One predominately used textbook or series? Multi-level materials? Materials from the classroom and school libraries for use in the classroom or at home? Textbooks with program workbooks? Individualized learning activities?

5. What should be the content of compensatory mathematics programs? The "new" math? The "old" math? Discussions of why learning mathematics is important? Relating mathematic skills to other courses in the curriculum?

Test-taking skills? Memorization of mathematics "facts"? Word problems? Computational skills? Inductive reasoning? Deductive reasoning? Practical mathematics?

6. How should mathematics instruction be divided during the day? Should it take place all at one sitting? Should it be divided into two or more periods? Should it be interspersed during the day with time for students to practice their skills?

7. How should students be grouped for mathematics instruction? In small groups? In large groups? In no groups, with individualized instruction only? In ethnically homogeneous groups? According to achievement? According to ability?

8. How much school time should be devoted to mathematics instruction each day? About 30 minutes? About 1 hour? About 90 minutes? About 2 hours? More than 2 hours?

9. In designing compensatory mathematics programs, for what kinds of school facilities should program planners look? Modern, new buildings which are physically appealing? Buildings with flexible space? Buildings which have special mathematics laboratories or resource centers?

10. If electing teachers to teach within a compensatory mathematics program, should program planners look for a blend of teacher characteristics according to the variables of sex, age, experience, academic preparation, background in mathematics teaching methods and theories, teachers' job satisfaction, teachers' self-concept, teachers' ethnic similarity to students? Are there other variables which are more important?

11. Who should be made aware of evaluation results for subsequent use? Classroom teachers? Trained paraprofessional teacher aides? Untrained paraprofessional teacher aides? Administrators? Special projects personnel? Parents and the community?

12. In planning compensatory mathematics programs, should program planners seek to establish a school climate which has a strong emphasis on discipline? One which is quiet and orderly? One which attempts to instill a sense of pride in the school in students and faculty and parents? One which is structured? One which is permissive?

13. How should students' mathematics ability be evaluated? Individually, at the end of each mathematics assignment? By locally developed mathematics diagnostic test? By commercially produced test geared to a single curriculum in use by the school? By standardized, mass-administered mathematics tests?

14. What should be a realistic goal of compensatory mathematics programs? That students will raise their mathematics achievement scores each year? That students will achieve a greater increase in their scores each year? That students will gain one year in their scores for each year in class? That students will achieve and maintain scores equal to the average children in their age group?

Questions Pertaining to Inservice Teacher Training

1. Who should design inservice programs? School district and administrative personnel? College and university faculty members? Federal agencies? Teachers? Parents and community members? Some combination?

2. What is the ideal content for inservice programs related to compensatory compensatory education? Teaching methods? Interpersonal relations? Discussing current critical issues? Discussions of new curricula? Use of educational technology? Planning or instituting educational change? Testing and evaluating students or materials? Establishing educational goals? Writing student behavioral objectives? Investigating special education techniques and approaches? Diagnosing learning problems? Using teacher aides effectively? Utilizing the physical space in the school more effectively? Investigating new methods of scheduling school time? Using varied methods of grouping students?

3. When should inservice programs take place? Should they occur before school? During school? After school? During the evenings? Over weekends? During the summer?

4. Should teachers be compensated for their participation inservice training, and if so how? Should they participate on a voluntary basis with no compensation? Should they be given release time? Should they be given stipends for attending? Should they be given stipends for the completion of useful products? Should they be given inservice credit towards salary differentials?

Questions Pertaining to Parents/Community Involvement

1. Should parents and/or the community be involved in the schools at all?

2. What should be the duties of parents and/or community members be in the schools? Should they serve in an

advisory capacity? Should they perform some vital functions? Should they both advise and perform?

3. In planning compensatory education programs which involve parents and/or the community, what kinds of organizational structures should program planners design to optimize this involvement? District-wide advisory councils? Parents/community members serving on various school committees? Opening the classroom to parents and/or community? Having parents/community members as district-wide activity coordinators? As region-wide activity coordinators? As school activity coordinators? As paraprofessional staff members? As home tutors?

4. What methods should program planners use to elicit parents/community response and participation? Home visits? Financial incentives? Workshops? Inservice training? In media campaign? Mass mailings?

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM THE INTERVIEWS

1. What should be the criteria for allowing students to remain eligible for continuation in a compensatory education program? Should students be brought to the average achievement level for their age and then lose eligibility? Should they be brought up to the average achievement level for their grade and then lose eligibility? Should low achieving disadvantaged students who rise to an average achievement level be eliminated from the program? Or, should disadvantaged students be educated to their full potential, taking them beyond average if they are qualified? Should compensatory education programs define as eligible participants only more capable students, for example, those who are just slightly below average in achievement, or should they concentrate upon students at the very bottom of the ability and achievement distribution?

2. Should program planners, in designing compensatory education programs, attempt to "mainstream" disadvantaged students or should they be separated from other students for some part of the day?

3. How should the special, separate compensatory experiences provided for disadvantaged students be correlated with the regular curriculum which they experience during the remainder of the school day?

4. Should professional associations of teachers participate in designing inservice teacher training? Or, as is the case in RENP, should the community and the school system assume the responsibility for such design?

5. In designing compensatory education programs, should program planners utilize a trainer-teacher ratio of 12:1, as is the case in RENP, or is there another, optimal configuration?

6. Who should decide whether or not teachers need inservice training in order to work in compensatory programs? Should the teachers decide? Should administrators decide? Should the community decide?

7. How should teachers be compensated by school systems for taking part in inservice training? Should they be given release time? Should they receive extra compensation? Should they not be given any compensation, but participate on a strictly voluntary basis?

8. What should the goals of a realistic compensatory education program be? Should such programs attempt to improve basic skills and other aspects of academic learning? Should they attempt to improve students' attitudes towards themselves? Towards school? Toward learning?

9. How should the outcomes of compensatory education programs be evaluated? Through the use of available, recognized, respected instruments such as objective tests of student achievement? Through the use of specially constructed instruments sensitive to the outcomes of particular programs? Through some combination?

10. Should the role of parents and members of the community be limited to setting goals for compensatory education programs? Or should parents/community members participate as staff members in actually operating the program?

11. In designing compensatory education programs, should program planners, in seeking to be responsive to the needs of the community, listen to a few highly articulate, aggressive parents regarding what "the community thinks", or should planners listen to larger numbers of less articulate, less aggressive parents and community members?